3 1761 08154667 3

UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

1557.

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Agents

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO

KARL W. HIERSEMANN
LEIPZIG

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

FOUNDED BY WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER

THE HEBREW STUDENT - - Vols. I–II, 1882–1883
THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT - Vols. III–VIII, 1883–1888
THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vols. IX–XI, 1889–1892
THE BIBLICAL WORLD - New Series, Vols. I–XLIII, 1893–1914

SHAILER MATHEWS, Editor
With the Co-operation of the Members of the Divinity Conference of the University of Chicago

---

NEW SERIES. VOL. XLIII

JANUARY—JUNE 1914

134508
4/10/14

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

BS
410
B58
n.s.
v.43

Published
January, February, March, April, May, June, 1914

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Roman numerals preceding the page reference indicate the number of each instalment in the series.

Christianity and the Mystery Religions. 3 . . . . . *Shirley Jackson Case*

Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel. II, 17; III, 105; IV, 226; V, 382. . . . . *William Adams Brown*

The Problems of Boyhood. I, 29; II, 99; III, 187; IV, 257; V, 326; VI, 396 . . . . . *Franklin W. Johnson*

Divorce and Social Welfare. 33. . . . . *Edwin Heyl Delk*

The Religion of the Hebrews and Modern Scholarship. IV, 44 . *J. M. Powis Smith*

The Educational Work of the Church. I, 123; II, 194; III, 265; IV, 333; V, 403 . . . . . *Theodore Gerald Soares*

The Origin and Teaching of the New Testament Books. V, 65; VI, 144; VII, 209; VIII, 281; IX, 354; X, 419 . . . . . *Ernest DeWitt Burton and Fred Merrifield*

The Life of Jesus in the Light of Modern Criticism. 75 . . . . *Lucius Hopkins Miller*

The Teaching of Jesus. 238 . . . . . " " "

The Divinity of Christ. 295 . . . . . " " "

Principles of Church Federation. I, 87; II, 167; III, 321 . . . *A. W. Anthony*

The Bible as Material for Sex Instruction. 91 . . . . . *James Perkins Burling*

Shall the Churches Take Psychical Research Seriously? 94 . . *George Barton Cutten*

The Student Volunteer Convention of 1914. 118 . . . . . *Ernest DeWitt Burton*

The Modern Sadducee. 120 . . . . . *James M. Campbell*

The Church and the Present-Day Labor Struggle. 155 . . . . *J. E. Williams*

A New Testament Anniversary: 1514–1914. 164 . . . . . *Edgar J. Goodspeed*

John the Baptist and Christ in the Slavic Translation of Josephus' *Jewish War*. 172 . . . . . *Bernhard Pick*

Can Religion Be Made Scientific? 178 . . . . . *Allyn K. Foster*

"Bitterness"—A Sermon. 219 . . . . . *G. A. Johnston Ross*

An Attempt at a Scientific Classification of Biblical Literature. 251 . . . . . *George A. Barton*

Samuel Rolles Driver. 291 . . . . . *Francis Brown*

An Imaginary Conversation. 305 . . . . . *A. K. Parker*

Present Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism. 310 . . . . . *James A. Montgomery*

Survey of the Relation of the Churches to State Universities. 363 *Richard C. Hughes*

Regeneration in Plants. 377 . . . . . *John M. Coulter*

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

Volume XLIII JANUARY 1914 Number 1

THE WILL TO GET AND THE WILL TO GIVE

"It is more blessed to give than to receive," said Jesus. "It is more blessed to get than it is to give" is the working creed of commercialism. The difference between the two outlooks on life is the difference between love and capitalism. An epoch begins in a man's life when he first thinks in terms of will instead of wealth.

A man's will is a man's moral self. What he wills is vastly more important than what he does, for his dominating purpose is the center of his life.

In these days of programs and general tinkering of our social order it is highly desirable that we face the matter of dominant will.

We want to be scientific in our goodness but we need first of all a drive toward goodness. Knowledge is only a tool. The bad man will use knowledge in the interests of a bad will, and the good man will use knowledge in the interests of a good will.

It is imperative that the church should recognize this simple fact. There are plenty of people who think they can reform the world because they have failed to reform individuals, but the problem is the same in society as with individuals. The dominating will fixes futures.

It is easy to develop the will to get because it is natural, born of the impulse for self-preservation and the super-impulse toward creature comfort.

But to develop the will to give requires help from God himself. For the will to give is not the survival of our age-long ancestry but is an intimation of immortality.

The will to give is more than a synonym for charity. It might better be described as the *will to share;* or possibly better still, the *will to love.* That, plainly enough, is the very opposite of the *will to power* of which certain philosophers speak so much.

It is the difference between Jehovah and Baal, Jesus and the Beast, God and Mammon.

This uncompromising contrast should stir the ambition of the church. If its mission were to tame the will to get, clothe it with respectability, and teach it good table manners, its task would be simple and as petty as simple.

The task the church actually faces requires audacity itself. It is no less than a reform against nature—or rather a reform of nature itself. As long as it remembers Calvary it can have no illusions as to the bitterness of the opposition which awaits it.

Men fight their benefactors as fiercely as their oppressors.

And the way of the benefactor will be hard just as long as the will to get is in command.

It is the business of religion to produce the will to give. It is a task at which it cannot play. The will to get cometh not forth save by prayer.

Religion is not a pretty thing; it is as severe as the crucifixion. When it seeks to be pretty it ceases to be significant. When, in the interests of quick results, it prefers bureaucracy to democracy, when it substitutes ritual for righteousness, when it undertakes to make selfishness respectable, it has ceased to be the temple of the God who saves by giving.

You cannot save the world by massaging out its sins or manicuring its virtues.

Salvation comes to a man or society only when by God's grace the will to get becomes the servant of the will to give.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE, PH.D.
Associate Professor of New Testament Interpretation, University of Chicago
Author of "The Historicity of Jesus"

"That he might gather together in one all things in Christ." That is Paul's interpretation of God's cosmic plan. It is an interpretation of human history that breeds religious enthusiasm. Our religion is not an isolated, appended device, but the supreme phase of God's dealings with his world.

With this Pauline philosophy in view we should expect to find in Christianity exactly what we do find, viz., survivals of other religions, bits of Grecian philosophy, the Hebrew theology, and the passionate religious hope of the Orient. True, taken all together they do not make Christianity any more than bits of matter make a human personality, but to understand Christianity it is necessary to understand something of this marvelous "gathering together of all things in Christ." Recent study in the mystery religions is one of such methods. Professor Case's article narrates facts which will be of great value to the student of Christianity.

How did Christianity originate? Was it at the outset a full-grown entity; or did it develop gradually, the process of development being determined, as in the case of all genuine growth, by environmental forces? This is a very difficult question to answer, not only because our information about the early days of the new religion is all too scanty, but because that religion has been so generally defined as a static quantity of doctrine, conduct, or ritual rather than a vital expression of religious experience.

We are becoming quite used to thinking of modern Christianity in terms of the religious life of individuals and communities. We are leaving the cloister and going to the market-place, believing that there we shall find religion at its best because we find it there in the making. We concede that the conditions of life surrounding the children of today will have much to do with determining the religious fiber of the men of tomorrow. And any faith which does not adjust itself to present-day methods of thinking, and is not worked out in vital touch with the great human problems of today, no longer represents for us the highest type of Christianity in our modern world.

Yet there is still a widespread disposition to maintain that primitive Christianity was free from this sort of determining influence. Prompted by a worthy desire to preserve its sacredness, we isolate it from all natural relationships and treat it as a wholly foreign insert into human history. But it may be that this well-meant apologetic effort is not so creditable to our faith as we had on first thought imagined. If we believe that Christianity today should draw

upon all sources of inspiration available in modern life, why should we so religiously strive to make primitive Christianity a purely other-worldly product? Will it not gain rather than lose in significance if we discover that even in the first century its foundations were as broad and its inspirations as wide as those of life itself? We may be doing the new religion a grave injustice by insisting that it was a restricted revelation received through a single channel, rather than a movement which united and enlarged in its own life other streams of inspiration already flowing in the ancient world.

From this point of view the question of early Christianity's relation to other religions becomes a purely historical one. If the probability of this relationship is discovered it will not in the least diminish our estimate of Christianity's worth nor will the new religion gain in significance if we find that such relationship is altogether improbable. With this understanding we may turn at once to our first main problem: Was contact with other religions so close, and of such a character, that it is likely to have affected the lives of the early Christians?

In the first place, one might fairly question whether it was at all possible for them, in view of their belief in Christianity's superiority, to derive anything from other sources. Undoubtedly they felt themselves to be advocates of the only true faith. Paul not only condemns both paganism and Judaism, but he anathematizes those who preach any type of Christianity different from his own. He sharply criticizes the Jews for their unprofitable legalism and their refusal to acknowledge Jesus' lordship. Though highly praising Judaism as a historic revelation, Paul feels it to be only a preliminary stage of religious history designed to pass away with the advent of Christianity. The wisdom of the Greeks is set aside as utterly worthless and doomed to destruction, while the popular religion of the gentile world is condemned for its immorality, its senseless idolatry, and its demoniacal character. Other Christians may not have held views identical in all respects with Paul's, yet in the main his opinions are probably fairly representative, particularly with respect to paganism.

These sweeping condemnations were to be expected under the circumstances. No competing religious movement could, as such, be allowed favorable comparison with Christianity. Formal criticism must in the nature of the case be wholesale. Since all other religions are held to be erroneous in principle and inferior in practice, the Christian critic does not stop to note items of value amid masses of alleged error. But it would hardly be safe to conclude from this doctrinaire attitude of the critic that valuable elements were not recognized on occasion, or that many such values were not actually absorbed by Christianity. Rarely does a victor fail to profit from contact with, and conquest over, a competitor, even though the latter's possessions are, in the heat of conflict, pronounced quite worthless. We know, for example, that Paul's formal criticism of the Jews did not deter him from retaining so much of Judaism as seemed to him valuable and suitable to the purposes of his new propaganda, nor did his condemnation of the Gentiles prevent him from recognizing that they might please

God by living according to the dictates of conscience. Opposition to other faiths as systems of religion did not necessarily prohibit the actual appropriation of worthy aspirations, noble ideals, or useful ideas from the contemporary world.

This process was further abetted by the idea that Christianity was the legitimate heir of all goodness which had previously existed. If Judaism or paganism held anything that seemed estimable, this without further ado was credited in Christianity's favor. Paul feels that not only his pre-Christian career but the entire Old Testament dispensation and the whole course of past history have been ordered with reference to the establishment of Christianity, and so form a proper part of its content in so far as Paul is able to make these things fit into his scheme of thinking. Similarly Justin Martyr after his conversion retains his high estimate of Greek philosophy by persuading himself that Heraclitus, Socrates, and many Stoics were virtually Christians since they had been enlightened by the Logos later to be more perfectly revealed in the person of Christ. According to the psychology of that day the supremacy and uniqueness of Christianity were adequately maintained by believing that items appropriated from other religions had been rescued from a false setting and restored to their divinely intended position in the new faith.

This situation is not materially changed when we recognize that Christians felt themselves divinely guided in the establishment of the new movement. The thought of a formal and completed revelation was hardly so prominent in the consciousness of the first missionaries as to constitute a totally impassable barrier between them and their contemporaries. Before the New Testament canon was definitely fixed the conception of revelation was much more elastic than in the later period. In fact, its very content was a product of experience. Judaism indeed was believed to offer a genuine historic revelation which guaranteed certain items of the new faith, but it did not furnish—at least not in the thought of Paul—a complete equipment for Christianity. This task had not been accomplished even by Jesus himself. Certain gaps remained to be filled in by believers from their own world of experience, and they courageously set about this undertaking, in all good conscience accounting themselves worthy on the ground of their belief in Christ, to equip the new faith with all features needful for the proper expansion of its life. This work, to be sure, was done under the direction of the divine spirit, but the result was a matter of immediate experience, its character and content being determined by the religious impulses of living Christians. Since their convictions were a product of actual life and since their experience matured under the pressure of new problems arising out of the particular circumstances in which they found themselves, we must guard against reading into the thinking of early believers the views of later generations who so objectivized and hardened the conception of revelation that it became the historically unconditioned source of all details in organization, ritual, and dogma which emerged with the gradual growth of the Christian society.

Not only did the attitude of the first Christians permit influence from other religions, but their situation must have tended to make such influence a significant factor in their lives. Perhaps we do not always realize that Christianity arose in a "very religious" world, and so we may not appreciate the significance of these surroundings for the genesis of the new movement. Its ultimate triumph has been so brilliant that we may imagine it was always the same dominant and self-sufficient religion which it is in our day. Even when the existence of its original competitors is recognized, their popularity and strength may be greatly discounted. The religions of the Roman Empire in the first century A.D. were not so completely decadent as we sometimes imagine. That was in reality a period of remarkable religious activity in which various types of faith spread themselves over the Mediterranean world. The strength and extent of Judaism are well known, but the Gentiles were hardly less religious in their own way than were the Jews. Paganism offered men the help of many different deities with a variety of doctrines and ceremonies designed to meet the needs of different classes of worshipers. Religion was a subject of general interest. It occupied a large place in the life of the common man, it was widely discussed by poets and philosophers, and even the state claimed to be established upon a religious basis.

The early Christians were in very close touch with this general situation even outside Palestine. Their very circumstances compelled contact with other faiths, a contact so close and so long continued that it at once suggests the probability of important genetic relationships between the new religion and its contemporaries. However extensively the former may abound in original features, one must admit that in childhood it was rocked in a Jewish cradle and that it grew to maturity in a gentile home. Its Jewish connections no one will dispute, but we must also remember that at an early date it was transferred to gentile lands. Long before the first century closed, the chief centers of Christian activity had moved from Palestine to Syrian Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, and possibly to Alexandria. All of these cities were strongholds of paganism with which Christianity was thus brought into close contact during the impressionable period of youth.

Nor did the contemporary religions fade away quietly before the new propaganda. On the contrary, they offered a stout resistance. It would be a grave mistake to suppose that the adherents of all other faiths were generally dissatisfied with their own religion. Just as Jehovah retained the allegiance of his chosen people, so the pagan deities had not only loyal followers but in some instances also energetic missionaries. Consequently we must not think that the Christian evangelists cultivated purely virgin soil, for in reality they worked fields already occupied by formidable competitors. Certainly at no time within the first century could it be said that the new religion had so completely displaced other faiths, or had so thoroughly isolated itself, as to make their influence an item of no possible consequence for its own life.

Since the missionaries were thus forced to compete for a place in occupied

territory they were not at liberty to create all religious data *de novo*. Their audiences were composed of people who had already worked out an extensive religious vocabulary, who gave much attention to the observance of traditional rites, and who thought in terms of certain generally accepted ideas. While the Christian preachers doubtless could not have won converts without proclaiming the newness and superiority of their message, still their prospects for success would probably have been slight had they not used the terminology which was familiar to their hearers and shown that the new religion, however novel and self-sufficient it might claim to be, conserved and enhanced the values of the old. The latter could not be totally ignored if Christianity was to meet, as its advocates manifestly intended it should, the same practical religious demands which its predecessors had, inadequately according to the Christian interpretation, sought to satisfy. Under these circumstances it was necessary for the Christian preacher to state his message in the religious language and thought-forms of the age. This pragmatic necessity may easily though perhaps often unconsciously have led Christians to enrich experience and evolve new ideas through the aid of contemporary religions.

This possibility is further strengthened by the fact that Christianity developed some of its important characteristics in response to the exigencies of expansion. It was necessary to make adjustments to new situations. At first the community seemed to think of itself chiefly as a messianic company of orthodox Jews, but Jewish rejection of its messianic teaching gradually forced the development of an independent organization. The practical demands of gentile missions also compelled a change of attitude toward the ceremonial law, a change to which some Palestinians strenuously objected. But the gentile forces prevailed. And ultimately the realistic Jewish eschatology, so dominant in the early days, had to be recast and the religious values which it embodied restated in other terms to correspond with the actual course of history and the more stable circumstances in which gentile Christians found themselves.

Furthermore, the membership of the churches in this formative period consisted mainly of converts from other faiths. Christianity was not yet old enough to have trained up men from youth within its own communion. In the early days very little attention was given to the children, doubtless because it seemed improbable that they would have time to grow to manhood before the end of the world should come. The importance of bringing them up within the church was later realized but the procedure apparently was contrary to early apostolic practice, since tradition sought to justify the innovation by recalling that Jesus had overridden the apostles' views when he said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me: forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." During the first century most members of Christian communities—until the last quarter of the century certainly a large majority—had formerly been adherents of other religions, and it is quite unlikely that their past could be completely obliterated in making the transition from one communion to

another. This effect of past training was evident in the case of Palestinians like James and his conservative associates in Jerusalem, as well as in the case of Hellenists like Stephen, Paul, and Apollos. That the situation would be similar among gentile converts is intrinsically most probable. When they came into Christianity they would bring with them certain religious characteristics which would thus become a vital part of developing Christianity.

Under these circumstances we must answer our initial question in the affirmative. Christianity's contact with other religions even in gentile territory was so close and of such a character that it is most likely to have affected the lives of many Christians. The recognition of this fact is not a denial of all originality to Christianity, nor does it exclude the creative activity of individuals who felt themselves divinely guided in the work of giving to the world a new religion. One must not overlook the important part played by these forceful personalities who were sponsors for the new movement. Yet they were not historically unconditioned; nor did they live their religion in a vacuum. If the Twelve from the moment of their turning to Jesus, and Paul from the day of his conversion, had withdrawn completely from contact with men, they would still have possessed a religious legacy from the past. But their program was not one of isolation; they associated closely with their fellows in the common walks of life. While they displayed strongly original spiritual natures, they also reacted upon the immediate religious problems of their own day, becoming "all things to all men" that they might by all means save some (I Cor. 9:22). Their new faith worked out its destiny in the arena of real life. As this scene of action was at first distinctly Jewish but soon became mainly gentile the probability of a genetic kinship between early Christianity and its religious environment, both Jewish and gentile, becomes a recognized fact.

Christianity's relation to Judaism has been investigated somewhat minutely, particularly in the last twenty-five years. But the study of Christianity's relation to Hellenistic religions is as yet in its infancy. If we may essay for a moment the rôle of prophet, we would venture to predict that New Testament research for perhaps the next quarter-century will be directed mainly toward this fascinating field.

Space will not permit so much as a bare outline of the whole religious situation in the Greco-Roman world of the first century A.D. We can consider but one item in this situation, the so-called mystery religions.

This term has come to be applied, in its technical sense, to a type of faith which emphasized the hope of future blessedness to be obtained by worshiping a deity, or deities, who themselves had triumphed over death and so were able to give their votaries a similar victory. In contrast with religions which were national in character, the Mysteries were individualistic, the individual attaching himself directly to the deity rather than to some national or civic group in order to obtain the help of the tutelary god. The Palestine Christians in so far as they required circumcision of gentile converts, thus making them Jews, were holding to the

national ideal; but when Paul conditioned salvation solely upon personal faith in Christ his position was of the mystery religion type. One became enrolled in the Mysteries through certain rites of initiation. Prominent among these was a pictorial exhibition of certain sacred things, a performance which usually assumed the character of a scenic display representing the deity's conquest over death. The priest, or preacher, expounded to the novice these so-called Mysteries, whence the name of this type of faith. The one to be initiated had previously observed stated rites of purification, and after initiation he took part in further ritualistic ceremonies such as eating the sacred meal, passing the night in the temple bed-chamber, or other acts which were thought to typify or secure union with the god. Thus the worshiper experienced a new birth. He was now a godman, for the deity dwelt in him and controlled his life. Since he had passed into a new and holy state of existence he was sure of sharing the deity's own victory over death, and even in this life he enjoyed anticipations of future blessedness in the form of ecstatic experiences produced by the indwelling divine spirit.

When Christianity as preached by Paul broke away from its national moorings and became the religion of a purely personal faith in a dying and rising divine redeemer, belief in whom guaranteed one a blessed future, it was answering the same sort of religious need which the Mysteries were designed to meet. Consequently we are led to ask whether the early Christians, especially in gentile lands, were influenced in favor of the mystery type of faith through contact with a world which was already working out its religious destiny along these lines.

To this question some modern scholars respond with an emphatic negative, as do Schweitzer and Clemen, to cite two of the most recent examples. They affirm that the mystery religions were not widely disseminated in the Mediterranean world in the first century A.D. and, further, in so far as they did exist at that time, they were not marked by those traits which later gave them a stronger resemblance to Christianity. To another group of investigators it seems clear that the mystery cults—or the great majority of them at least—had a wide vogue even in pre-Christian times, and that they had already assumed in the first century A.D. the main characteristics which marked their likeness to Christianity. In view of these assertions we must ask: (1) How widely were the Mysteries disseminated in the pre-Christian period? and (2) What were their chief characteristics at this time?

The best-known deities of these cults were Demeter and Dionysus (or Bacchus) in Greece, Cybele and Attis in Phrygia, Mithra in Persia, Ishtar and Tammuz in Babylonia, Atargatis and Hadad in Cilicia, Ashtart and Eshmun [or Adon]—the Aphrodite and Adonis of the Greeks—in Syria, and Isis, Osiris, and Serapis in Egypt. It is not practicable, however, at present to trace in detail the history and character of all these cults; we must content ourselves with a consideration of one or two of them.

The well-known Eleusinian mysteries centered about the figure of the great

mother-goddess, Demeter, whose worship is mentioned time and again by Greek writers before the beginning of our era. The same thing is true of the Dionysus cult, and of kindred religious movements in Greece. To cite some of the evidence, Herodotus (fourth century B.C.) has one of his characters explain to a Persian inquirer how very popular and powerful Demeter is and how numerous are the number of persons initiated into her mysteries (viii. 65). Other ancient testimony of the same sort is abundant. Nearer to Christian times, Cicero says that the most distant nations were initiated into the sacred and august Eleusinia. And further:

> Much that is excellent and divine does Athens seem to me to have produced and added to our life, but nothing better than those mysteries by which we are formed and molded from a rude and savage life into humanity; and indeed in the mysteries we perceive the real principles of life and learn not only to live happily but to die with a fairer hope.

Another writer, Crinogoras, who belonged to the age of Augustus, exhorted his friend to visit Athens and see the sacred rites of Demeter even though he might not be able to travel anywhere else. The continued popularity of this cult is evidenced by Augustus' initiation in 21 B.C.; by Claudius' desire to transfer the Eleusinia to Rome about the middle of the first century A.D.; by Hadrian's initiation to the first grade in 125 A.D. and to the third in 129; and by a similar procedure in the case of other well-known persons. Other deities are also mentioned in connection with this same type of religion. Herodotus tells us of the Scythian king's fondness for Greek manners, and especially of his initiation into the mysteries of Bacchus in which the god "took possession" of the king, the king was "maddened" by the god. Demosthenes (third century B.C.) taunts one of his opponents with worshiping the Phrygian Sabazius:

> You assisted your mother in the initiations, you read aloud the ritual prayers, and took part in the rest of the plot. You put on the fawn skins for the candidates, you sprinkled them with water from the bowl, you purified and rubbed them with clay and bran, then you raised them from their purification and bade them say, "I have fled the bad and found the better."

We learn from a poem of the second century B.C. that even children were initiated into the mysteries of Dionysus. This poem, doubtfully ascribed to Theocritus, is written in honor of a boy nine years old whose right to initiation is justified by the piety of his father: "To the children of pious fathers belong the good things rather than to those that come of impious men." Compare Paul's belief in the sanctity of the children when even one parent is a Christian (I Cor. 7:14). In a similar vein the Orphic tablets say of the novitiate: "O blessed and happy one, thou hast put off thy mortality and hast become divine."

These more distinctly Greek mysteries were early supplemented by similar tendencies coming in from the Orient. Under Alexander's successors, and later under the Romans, national religions of the old type rapidly disappeared. The national deities of the ancient world lost caste when the dominions which they were supposed to protect fell a hopeless

prey first to the Greek and then to the Romans. But loss of prestige for these deities did not mean the abandonment of religion by the people; it meant rather the reconstruction of religious life and thinking along different lines. Instead of searching for a deity who could save a nation men began to look for a god who could save an individual. Various deities competed for first place in answer to this demand, and the result was a vigorous activity on the part of different oriental mystery cults in the Greco-Roman world.

Nor was this type of religion a new thing in Hellenistic times. Most of the redeemer-gods worshiped in this period had existed in some part of that ancient world from days of old. They had not always occupied a foremost place in the official pantheon of the different national faiths, but their rites were often very primitive in character. Their myths also reveal the important rôle which they had played in the early stages of civilization and the large place they held in popular esteem perhaps quite apart from, or in spite of, priestly official adjustments of various deities' relative positions. A god might be securely enthroned in the hearts of common men even though his standing among the Olympians was very doubtful.

These oriental mysteries offered a type of religion similar in many fundamental respects to the ancient mysteries of Greece, and they spread widely and became popular before the beginning of our era not only in the eastern Mediterranean lands but even in Rome. The Phrygian mother-goddess, Cybele, is mentioned by Pindar as known among the Greeks in the sixth century B.C. Her consort, Attis, had a private cult in Greece as early as the fourth century B.C. and public worship of Attis was carried on there in the second century B.C. The Roman historian, Livy, writing in the time of Augustus, tells us that the worship of Cybele had been officially introduced into Rome in the year 204 B.C. in order to save the city from the Carthaginian invaders. The Romans were successful and Cybele, accordingly, was honored with a temple and from that time on her position was officially recognized at Rome. Attis must soon have joined her, for in the time of Claudius, before the middle of the first century A.D., the devotees of Cybele and Attis celebrated a yearly festival, under official patronage, at the time of the vernal equinox, in which the death of Attis, mourning for the dead god, and rejoicing at his resurrection constituted the prominent features of the ceremony. The worshipers performed various rites to symbolize or effect union with the deity, whose career was represented in a kind of mystery play. But this performance was not wholly new to Rome even in Claudius' day. Catullus, a century earlier, wrote a poem entitled "Atys," in which he described the ecstatic frenzy of the devotee who performed rites by which he took on the nature of the goddess, clothed himself in the divine garment, participated in the maddening dance, and became the avowed bondsman of Cybele forever. Thus the Cybele-Attis religion had reached out from its native Phrygian domains, gaining official recognition and support in the capital of the Roman Empire, while Christianity was still

making its first appearance in the homeland of the Cybele-Attis cult.

The Syrian Adonis was a prominent rival of Attis. and fostered almost identically the same type of religious belief and practice. The Adonis festival described by Theocritus as held at the court of Ptolemy II, early in the second century B.C., has many striking resemblances to the Attis festival of Claudius' day. But the question of genetic kinship does not interest us at present; we are seeking rather to discover the religious thought and feeling which lay behind the ceremony. Among the sacred things displayed were representations of Aphrodite and Adonis joined in wedlock, the death of the god, the mourning of the goddess, and Adonis' restoration to life. In the words of Theocritus, the musician at the sacred festival sings:[1]

The bridal bed for Adonis spread of my own making is;
Cypris hath this for her wrapping, Adonis that for his.
Of eighteen years or nineteen is turned the rose-limbed groom;
His pretty lip is smooth to sip, for it bears but flaxen bloom.
And now she's in her husband's arms, and so we'll say good night;
But tomorrow we'll come with the dew, the dew, and take hands and bear him away
Where plashing wave the shore doth lave, and there with locks undight
And bosoms bare all shining fair will raise this shrilling lay:
O sweet Adonis, none but thee of the children of gods and men
'Twixt overworld and underworld doth pass and pass again;
That cannot Agamemnon, nor the Lord o' the Woeful Spleen [Ajax],
Nor the first of the twice ten children that came of the Troyan queen [Hector],
Nor Patroclus brave, nor Pyrrhus bold that home from the war did win,
Nor none o' the kith o' the old Lipith nor of them of Deucalion's kin—
E'en Pelops' line lacks fate so fine, and Pelasgian Argos' pride.
Adonis sweet, Adonis dear,
Be gracious for another year;
Thou'rt welcome to thine own alway,
And welcome we'll both cry today
And next Adonis-tide.

When Paul two centuries later preached in the regions of Syria and Cilicia his message about the crucified and risen redeemer of Christian faith, the Adonis religion was still thriving, its two chief centers of worhip being Byblos in Syria and Paphos in Cyprus. And we may safely assume that many members of Paul's gentile congregations were familiar with the mystic drama depicting the death of Adonis, the lamentation following his decease, the rejoicing at his resurrection, and shared the religious satisfaction which that faith gave to its votaries.

We shall draw our final illustration from the Isis-Osiris-Serapis cults. Their wide dissemination in the Hellenistic world is one of the most evident facts in the religious history of that period. Isis and Osiris are familiar figures in the religion of ancient Egypt, and their relation to one another is similar to that of Cybele and Attis, or Aphrodite and Adonis. The name of Serapis, which displaces, or rather absorbs, that of Osiris, was introduced by Ptolemy I

[1] Translated by J. M. Edmonds, *Greek Bucolic Poets*.

late in the third century B.C. when he virtually made this cult the official religion of Hellenistic Egypt. The genealogy of Serapis is very obscure, yet the cult of Isis-Serapis is essentially identical with that of the earlier Isis-Osiris, and the names of Osiris and Serapis are perpetuated side by side.

Herodotus doubtless could have given us much valuable information about the Egyptian mysteries had he not been himself so loyal a devotee of the mystery religions, and consequently so reverential toward their secrets. Yet he tells us some interesting things. Of the mysteries at Sais he says:

> In the sacred precinct of Minerva [who corresponds to Isis] behind the chapel and joining the whole of the wall is the tomb of one whose name I consider it impious to divulge on this occasion. And in the inclosure stand large stone obelisks, and there is a lake near, ornamented with a stone margin, formed in a circle, and in size as appeared to me much the same as that in Delos, which is called the circular. In this lake they perform by night the representation of that person's adventures which they call μυστήρια, "Mysteries." On these matters, however, though accurately acquainted with the particulars of them, I must observe a discreet silence.

He is speaking, of course, about the career of the dying and rising Osiris. Again he says of Isis, that the second in importance of all the Egyptian festivals was held in her honor in the city of Busiris, situated in the middle of the Delta. In connection with this festival "all the men and women to the number of many myriads beat themselves after the sacrifice; but for whom they beat themselves it were impious for me to divulge." We can easily guess "for whom"—the dead Osiris of course.

The wide spread of this religion outside of Egypt in pre-Christian times is well attested. Diodorus of Sicily in his *History* cites an inscription from a tomb of Isis and Osiris at Nysa in Arabia, and much the same language has also been found on an inscription from Ios. Tibullus in the year 29 (or 31) B.C., when compelled to abandon his military pursuits on account of sickness, writes from Corcyra to his fiancée, Delia, in Rome:

> What does your Isis for me now, Delia? What avail me those brazen sistra of hers so often shaken by your hand? Or what am I the better for remembering that while you were pursuing her rites you bathed purely and lay alone in a pure bed [signifying marriage union with the deity]? Now, now goddess, help me, for that man may be healed by thee is proved by many a picture in thy temples.

Writing a couple of years earlier in commemoration of Messala's birthday, Tibullus refers also to Osiris as thoroughly familiar to the Romans. The mention of a Serapaeum in a city ordinance of Pozzuoli in 105 B.C. shows that the Serapis cult likewise traveled to Italy at an early date. Thus the Egyptian mystery religions spread in Italy despite the opposition—due in some measure perhaps to Rome's jealousy of Alexandria—which was raised against them, for they anticipated Christianity in incurring Roman persecution, records of which we have for the years 59, 58, 53, 48 B.C., and 19 A.D. Yet, like Christianity a century later, they seemed only to thrive the more for opposition.

Also in the East, Egyptian mysteries

spread extensively from the beginning of the third century B.C. on. In the time of Ptolemy Soter the worship of both Isis and Serapis was established at Athens, the latter having a temple at the foot of the Acropolis. In the regions round about the Levant the worship of these gods enjoyed undisturbed prosperity for three hundred years before Paul appeared upon the scene.

The general character of the Egyptian mysteries is the same as that of the Cybele-Attis, or the Aphrodite-Adonis cults. The story of Osiris' death and resurrection, and his significance for the life of the believer, are essentially the same as in the case of similar deities. Here again we find a mother goddess personifying the source of life, and associated with her a consort who impersonates the hope of triumph in the ever-present human struggle of life over death. Plutarch, a Greek interpreter of the Isis-Osiris religion, writing at approximately the same period when the fourth evangelist wrote his gospel interpreting Christianity to the Greeks, says of Isis:

> She is the female principle of nature and that which is capable of receiving all generation in virtue of which she is styled by Plato "nurse" and "all-receiving," but by people in general she is called the "one of numberless names" because she is converted by the logos [that is, Osiris, who is identified with the Logos, the Word] into and receives all appearances and forms.

In fact, Osiris in his Logos-function, according to Plutarch, brought the world and all it contains into being (*Is. and Os.* liv). Furthermore, Plutarch interprets the mourning for Osiris and the celebration of his resurrection as symbolic of the death and revival of nature, but he also sees in this triumph something which is—"spiritual," shall we say, and cosmic. Hence its redemptive significance. To use his own words:

> But the avenger of Osiris [i.e., Isis] . . . . did not forget the contests and struggles she had gone through, nor yet her own wanderings, nor did she suffer oblivion and silence to envelop her many deeds of wisdom, many feats of courage, but by intermingling in the most sacred ceremonies, images, hints, and representations of her sufferings of yore, she consecrated at one and the same time both lessons of piety and consolation for men and women when overtaken by misfortune. And she, together with Osiris, having been translated from the rank of good spirits [demons] up to that of gods by means of their virtue . . . . receive not inappropriately the united honors of gods and of spirits everywhere, both in the regions above the earth and in those under ground, possessing the supreme power (xxviii).

Perhaps Plutarch was the first to expound the significance of Isis and Osiris in these particular terms, though that is by no means certain, but for generations devotees of these gods had been observing these sacred ceremonies of the cult, nourishing piety upon, and deriving consolation from, the memory of these deities' sufferings, and worshiping them with hearts more or less full of appreciation and reverence according to the capacity of the worshiper. This was the situation in many a community before Paul appeared preaching his suffering redeemer, "placarded before the eye crucified" (Gal. 3:1), who in virtue of his humility and self-sacrifice for man's welfare had been highly exalted to his heavenly reward and given an authority to which every knee should bow of

things in the heaven, and things on earth and things under ground (Phil. 2:5–10).

From this hasty survey let us draw what seem to be the natural and legitimate conclusions. We are forced to affirm that the Mysteries were widely disseminated in pre-Christian times and that they occupied a very important place in religious life. And, further, it seems clear that many of their central conceptions, such as the expectation of a blessed immortality through attachment to a savior who himself died but overcame death in his resurrection, anticipated some things which were strongly emphasized in Christianity. Doubtless many disciples of the mystery gods were converted to Christianity, and there found, in the mystery staged so vividly by Paul in his word-painted portrait of the drama on the cross, a greater satisfaction than they had been able to derive from faith in Attis, Adonis, or Osiris. On the other hand, it is not improbable that Christianity on gentile soil was influenced by the Mysteries through the very necessity of becoming acclimated in that religious zone. I have not, to be sure, discussed whether Paul borrowed this or that idea or phrase from the Mysteries, for such questions seem to me quite incapable of yielding intelligible answers unless we treat them in the light of the more general situation. It is this latter which I have tried to portray. Indeed the primary problem is not how many static items other religions may have supplied to Christians, but rather how far the motives for religious living, and the standards by which religious values and ideals were estimated—for these are the forces which really determine doctrine and practice in the first instance—were brought over by Christian converts from other faiths, or were inspired by contact with other religions on the mission field. In this respect we believe that contemporary religions, and particularly the Mysteries, did contribute something to the making of Christianity in the first century of its career.

Shall we say, then, that Paul for example created his Christianity by deliberately appropriating a series of items first from one source and then from another, at last welding these promiscuous materials together as best he could into something which might look like a unit in itself? Most certainly not. Paul's religion was no such artificial creation; it was an affair of real life, a product of many vital forces which intermingled in the making of his experience. And since the Mysteries occupied a prominent place in his world they exerted their proportionate share of influence upon his life. Because his lot was cast in a time and in regions where the religious life of humanity was employing this coinage to estimate its values, because the human spirit in that day was working out its problems along these lines, Paul's religion also shows this coloring. Nor need we say that he was simply stooping to accommodate himself to his age; rather he was imbibing its atmosphere, growing strong in faith and mighty in spiritual stature as he worshiped and served his crucified and risen redeemer in the language and under the inspirations furnished by the religious world of his day.

That we may more truly appreciate—perhaps indeed respect—the attainments

of the religious spirit in that ancient world, let me quote the dedicatory prayer of one who has just been initiated into the mysteries of Isis. Though it comes to us in a literary document of the second century A.D.,[1] there is no reason to think that many a devotee of this much-revered goddess had not cherished similar sentiments centuries earlier.

The novitiate prays:

Thou, O holy and perpetual preserver of the human race, always munificent in cherishing mortals, dost bestow the sweet affection of a mother on the misfortunes of the wretched. Nor is there any day or night, nor so much as the minutest particle of time, which passes unattended by thy bounties. Thou dost protect men both by sea and land, and, dispersing the storms of life, dost extend thy health-giving right hand, by which thou dost unravel the inextricably entangled threads of the Fates, and dost assuage the tempests of fortune and restrain the malignant influences of the stars. The gods of heaven adore thee; thou dost roll the sphere of the universe round the steady poles, thou dost illuminate the sun, thou dost govern the universe, thou dost tread the realms of Tartarus. The stars move responsive to thy command, the gods rejoice in thy divinity, the seasons return by thy appointment, and the elements are thy servants. At thy nod the breezes blow, the clouds are nurtured, the seeds germinate, and the blossoms increase. The birds as they hover through the air, the wild beasts as they roam on the mountains, the serpents that hide in the earth, and the monsters that swim in the sea are terrified at the majesty of thy presence. But I so weak in capacity for celebrating thy praises, and possessing such slender means for offering sacrifices, have far from eloquence sufficient to express all that I conceive of thy majesty. Not a thousand mouths, and tongues as many, not an eternal flow of unwearied speech, would be equal to the task. I will, therefore, use my utmost endeavors to do what, poor as I am, still one truly religious may do—I will figure to myself thy divine countenance and will ever preserve this most holy divinity locked up in the deepest recesses of my breast.

[1] Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, xi.

MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL

II. THE BIBLE, WHAT IT IS AND HOW TO USE IT

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.
Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary
Author of "Christian Theology in Outline"

Let me recall for a moment the conclusions which we reached in the preceding article. We saw, in the first place, that theology is the science which tries to express in simple and intelligible language the great convictions by which the soul lives, the convictions which express our ultimate faith concerning the meaning and purpose of life, the nature of religion and its object, the destiny of the individual and society, and the way in which that destiny may best be realized.

We saw, in the second place, that modern theology is simply the application of the scientific method to religion, that is to say, the method of systematic and orderly study according to principles which have been found practically effective in other realms.

We saw, in the third place, that the result of the application of this method has been twofold: first, it has given us new tools which help us to solve particular difficulties and to answer particular questions; and secondly, it has given us a new point of view of life and of the world as a whole.

In the concluding part of the article we summed up certain general results of the modern theological movement which are of practical interest and importance for the preacher.

We saw, in the first place, that religion is one of the ultimate facts of life. It is not something outside of man which he may take or leave as he chooses. It is inwrought into his nature, a part of the very structure of his being, which he cannot maim or stifle without at the same time injuring himself.

We saw, in the second place, that while religion is universal, not all religion is equally valuable or equally satisfying. Religions differ in kind, and difference in kind means difference in worth.

We saw, in the third place, that if there is to be a universal religion at all it must be Christianity, and this for the simple reason that no other religion meets so completely and in so satisfying a way the permanent religious needs of humanity.

Lastly, we saw that Jesus Christ is central in Christianity and the final standard by which all that calls itself Christian must be tested.

Let me linger for a moment upon this last point, for it is one of the highest importance. No aspect of modern theology is more significant than the renewed emphasis which it has given to Jesus Christ. It is not simply that it has told us more about him, although that is true. It is not simply that it has recovered from the mists which had

obscured him the historic figure whose life and death and resurrection the Gospels record. It is not simply that it has distinguished the Christ of the New Testament from later theological speculation concerning him, but that it has shown us more clearly than we had ever realized before how fundamental is the place which Jesus holds in the religion to which he has given his name.

There are three different ways in which Christ is central in Christianity. In the first place, he is its founder. From him came the impulse from which the new religion sprang, and to this day his person marks the dividing line between all that went before and all that has come after.

Nor is this division one of time only. Jesus is not simply the founder; he is the standard of the Christian religion. He is the test by which we distinguish what is truly Christian from what is so only in name. Christianity is a historical religion and, like everything historical, contains elements of very different antecedents and value. Much that calls itself Christian can be paralleled in other religions, is in fact derived from them. But Christ is unique. There is no second Jesus.

This does not mean that Christianity is simply the reproduction of Jesus' teaching, or the imitation of his example. Such a description fails altogether to do justice to the real place which Christ holds in Christianity. He is not merely the standard, but the object of Christian faith. He is not simply the test of right thinking, but the inspiration to right living. In a word, he is the inspiring and vitalizing principle of Christianity through contact with whom its spirit is constantly renewed and purified.

This has an important bearing upon our present interest, for it gives us a principle which we shall find practically helpful in what we are trying to do. We are planning to take up one by one some of the fundamental questions of the religious life and to ask what new help modern theology gives us in their solution. We shall find that the most important contribution which theology has to make is not any one specific answer, but a new point of view. Modern theology may be described as the effort to bring to bear upon these old problems of the religious life the new light which Jesus Christ has shed upon them.

There have been three great themes which in every age have engaged the attention of religious men. The first is authority, the second is God, the third is salvation. What is the source of religious faith, or, in other words, what is the seat of authority in religion? What is the object of religious faith—the unseen Being on whom we depend, to whom we look up, and with whom we commune? What is the effect of religious faith? How does it help us practically? What difference does it make whether we are religious or not? These are the three perennial questions of religion. We shall take them up in turn and ask ourselves what light modern theology has to shed upon each.

And first, of the source of religious faith, or the problem of authority in religion. This brings us to the subject of the present article: the Bible, what it is and how to use it.

There are two reasons for beginning with the Bible. The first is because it is the point at which modern theology began; the second is because it is in con-

nection with the Bible that we find the most pressing and the most difficult of our practical problems.

In the time that remains I propose to raise and to answer, so far as I can, the following four questions: First, why do we need a Bible at all? Secondly, how did the old Bible meet this need? Thirdly, what change has modern theology made in our view of the Bible? Fourthly, what practical effect will this change have upon the preacher's work?

Why, then, do we need a Bible? This is our first question. I answer, for two reasons. In the first place, we need it as a source of religious inspiration and guidance for the individual soul, and, in the second place, we need it as a standard for the church.

We need the Bible as a source of religious inspiration and instruction for the individual. It is one of the most familiar features of our religious life that, like all life, it has to be constantly renewed. If it is not fed from without, it will starve. Now, the most natural way to feed the religious life is to draw upon the resources of someone else whose life is rich. Prayer is the supreme example of this renewal of life through contact with a higher source of supply. I shall have more to say of prayer by and by. But one of the perplexing features of this whole matter of religion lies just here, that while prayer is open to every one of us, we are not always equally in the mood for prayer. What are we to do in such a case as this? There is one very obvious thing that we can do, and that is to come into contact with some other man or woman who has the spirit of prayer. This is the philosophy of church-going. Men go to church in order to renew and enrich their devotional nature by contact with others whose nature is richer and fuller than their own. The function of the preacher as from Sunday to Sunday he stands in the pulpit is to vitalize and to renew the starved and parched lives in his congregation by imparting those more abundant resources to which his own life has access.

But who is to feed the preacher? Here is where the Bible comes in. The Bible is the great repository of the spiritual life of the past. Through the Bible we meet the men who have been greatest in religion, Moses and David and Isaiah and Jeremiah and St. Paul, and our Lord himself. The Bible is the book of the ideal, holding up before us the standard of truth and duty when our own vision grows dim. The Bible is the book of warning, reminding us, when we are tempted to forget it, of the inevitable consequences of sin. The Bible is the book of comfort, bringing into our loneliness and isolation the consciousness of a divine companionship and an unfailing love. The Bible is the book of hope, gilding the cloud of our discouragement with the golden lining of the ideal, painting before us the outlines of the holy city, the home of righteousness and brotherhood and peace, which is some day to come down from heaven to earth. The Bible, then, I repeat, is the great source of inspiration and of instruction for the individual religious life. *The Bible is the book that preaches to the preacher.*

But religion is not simply an individual affair. It is a social matter as well, and this brings me to the second great function of the Bible, namely, its use as a standard. When we look over

Christendom we find that Christians are divided into groups, differing one from another in beliefs and practices, and, what is still more important, in habits of feeling. These differences constitute one of the great obstacles to the success of our preaching. They are an obstacle at home, multiplying churches where fewer strong churches would be more effective. But they are a far greater obstacle on the foreign field, introducing confusion and distrust where simplicity and directness are all-important. What we need here is some statement to which we can all refer, some platform on which we can all stand, and such a platform we have in the Bible.

There are two ways in which the Bible is fitted to act as such a standard. It is fitted outwardly because it is the one book in whose use all Christians are agreed, and it is fitted inwardly by the nature of its contents, for it is the book which gives us the most direct, reliable, and first-hand knowledge of Jesus Christ, the founder, the standard, and the renewer of the Christian religion.

The Bible, then, I repeat, if it is to do what we require, must fulfil a double function. It must be the source of religious inspiration and guidance for the individual, and it must be the common standard of faith and practice for the church. Now, this was just what historic theology has asserted of the Bible from the beginning. The Bible, it tells us, is in the first place the great means of grace, and, in the second place, it is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We shall ask in a moment how the Bible was supposed to render this double service. But at the outset it is important for us to recognize that the need here pointed out is a real need. We need today just the kind of help in our individual and social life that our fathers and mothers found in the Bible.

What kind of a book then was this old Bible supposed to be? In the first place, it was supposed to be an inerrant Bible, and by that we mean that it was a Bible which by a special activity of the divine Spirit had been preserved in all its parts from mistake. It was accurate in its history, accurate in its science, accurate in its chronology, accurate, it need not be said, in its morals and its religion. You could open it at any page and be perfectly sure that the sentence which you read came to you as a message straight from God.

From this first characteristic a second followed. It was a book that was all on a level. I have said you could open it at any page and find a message straight from God. That was just what the old theologians did. They chose their proof-texts indiscriminately from Genesis to Revelation, confident that in a book which had God for its author there could be no inconsistency or contradiction.

As a matter of fact, however, there proved to be practical difficulties in the application of the method. When the different passages were compared one with another their teaching did not always seem to agree. There were differences as to statement of fact, such as the two stories of the flood, or the two accounts of the choice of Saul to be king. What was more serious, there were apparent differences in the moral and religious standards applied. Now God was represented as a jealous God, ruthless in his opposition to evil, calling upon the Israelites to exterminate the

Amalekites, man, woman, and child; smiting Uzzah dead when he laid presumptuous hands upon the ark, punishing David's sin by a pestilence that swept away seventy thousand of his people; and again he was tender and compassionate, more ready to forgive than an earthly father, and requiring forgiveness of men, even to seventy times seven.

Now, so long as it was a matter of the individual alone this difficulty was not an insuperable one. A man seeking spiritual food could always find what he needed in the Bible. When he met a hard passage he could do what we all do in such cases—pass it by and go on to something that is simpler. But in the case of the church at large the matter was more perplexing. It was not possible here to shirk the difficulties. One must look the apparent contradictions in the face and find some way of reconciling them.

There were two possible ways which might be taken. One of them was the method of allegory. One might say that the teaching of the Bible was not meant to be interpreted literally. The Bible is a spiritual book, veiling its meaning under parables, only to be understood in the light of the teaching of the same Spirit that inspired it. This was a method very popular in the early church. Origen, the great Alexandrian theologian, uses it, and multitudes have followed his example.

But the trouble with this method is that it goes too far. If you cannot trust the plain teaching of Scripture at one point, how can you be sure that it is to be trusted at any? If you spiritualize the accounts of God's anger may you not equally explain away the accounts of his love? Our Protestant fathers rejected the method of allegory and substituted therefor the method of harmony. They contended that every sentence in the Scriptures must be interpreted at its face value; that if we read in the account of the flood at one time that the animals went in two by two, and again that they went in seven by seven, there were two sets of animals who went in, and so on all along the line. Now, I am not interested here to follow out this method or to criticize it. I want simply to call attention to this one point, that, as an effort to meet the practical difficulty for which it was designed, it was a failure, and that for the very simple reason that there was no standard provided to determine whose solution of the particular difficulty in question was correct.

In theory, indeed, the old Protestant view of the Bible was a very simple one. Everyone went to it for himself and interpreted it under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The assumption was that the men who went in the right spirit would come to identical results. But as a matter of fact they did not come to identical results. They came to very different results. Who was to decide between them? Evidently there was need of some second standard which could be used as a guide in the interpretation of the Bible, and such a standard was actually found in the doctrine and tradition of the church.

Now, if everybody had been in the same church this would have been well enough, but as we all know this was not the case. The Protestants themselves were divided into their several denominations. There were the Anglicans and

the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists and the Methodists, and these again were divided into different schools and parties. There were the Calvinists and the Arminians. There were the Antinomians and the Legalists, there were the High Churchmen and the Low Churchmen and the Broad Churchmen. Each of these had their own tradition, their own standard, their own creed by which they measured the interpretation of the Bible; and while in theory they all declared that the Bible was the supreme standard, and everybody must be free to interpret it for himself under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, in practice they repudiated this principle. As an actual means of bringing about agreement among Christians as to the essentials of faith and practice, the older way of using the Bible has not been successful.

Here modern theology comes to our aid, for it furnishes us with a point of view which makes possible a scientific interpretation of the Bible, that is to say, an interpretation whose methods and results shall commend themselves equally to all men of impartial spirit. Let me try, if I can, to state what this view is.

There are two points in which the newer view of the Bible differs from the old. In the first place, it lays greater emphasis upon the human element in its composition. The Bible, as we have come to look at it today, is a composite book, that is to say, it is a book which is the product of many different authors, writing over a long period of time and making use of materials in part furnished for them by the science and philosophy of the time. It is a book, therefore, which has to be interpreted by the standards which we use in reading other literature of the same kind. We have to distinguish the different purposes which influenced the authors and the different literary forms which they used. We have to ask ourselves what light is shed on the meaning of a particular passage or book by the conditions of the time, or the practices which prevailed among contemporary people at the same general stage of culture. In short, we have to use the same methods which have already proved so successful in the interpretation of the literature of other ancient peoples.

From this conclusion a second follows —that not all parts of the Bible stand on the same moral and spiritual level. The Bible is not a single book, but a library; or rather, to be exact, two libraries. It is a collection extending over many centuries and telling the story of a progressive revelation. Beginning on a comparatively low level of culture and dealing with men of primitive and simple ways of thought and feeling, we rise little by little to the greatest heights of experience and insight which humanity has yet attained. It is clear that in the use of a book of this kind discrimination is necessary. We cannot pick out a text anywhere from Genesis to Revelation and apply it without reference to its context. We must read the earlier in the light of the later; the part in the light of the whole. Isaiah means more to us than Kings, Romans than Isaiah, and the Gospels than all three. We are Christians, and to us Christ is greater than Isaiah, greater even than St. Paul.

Now, how does this help us practically? At first sight it would seem as though such a view were anything but

helpful. If the Bible is a composite book, representing different grades of moral and spiritual insight, making use of elements derived from other sources which, in turn, differ in value, what becomes of its divine authority? How can we still have confidence in its teaching? How is it fitted to serve as the infallible helper and guide that we need?

Let us remind ourselves again what it is that we need in the Bible. We need two things: in the first place, food for our own souls, and secondly, a common standard of faith and practice.

I say, we need food for our own souls. But who are we, and what kind of food do we need? Well, in the first place, we are people of different degrees of spiritual maturity, and in the second place, we are, or at least it is to be hoped we are, people who are growing.

We are people who differ in spiritual maturity, and that means that we need different kinds of spiritual food. Some of us are still children, literally, or if not in years, then at least in point of view. What we need in our Bible is some interesting story that will bring home the truth in picturesque form and point a moral, simple enough for us to understand—such a story, for example, as that of Joseph and his brethren, or of David and Jonathan. Some of us are plain men and women bearing the burden and heat of the day, too busy to have much time and thought for speculation or hard questions, and what we need is the assurance that there is a good God who cares for us and who gives us the supply that we need day by day. Our standpoint is like that of the simple folk for whom Luther wrote his Smaller Catechism, when he defined Creation by saying: I believe that God "has given and still preserves to me body and soul, eyes, ears, and all my limbs, my reason and all my senses; and also clothing and shoes, food and drink, house and home, wife and child, land, cattle, and all my property." And we find our need best met by the Twenty-third Psalm or the sixth chapter of Matthew. And some of us, it may be a very few, are philosophers whose minds are constantly occupied with the puzzles of existence, who have formed the habit of inquiry and question and who want some answer that presses back of the surface of things to their ultimate meaning. Job is the book that comes closest home to us, or the story of Paul's struggle in the seventh chapter of Romans.

But this is not all. Not only have we different needs as individuals, but these needs differ from time to time. We are growing. Those of us who are children will some day be men and women; those of us who were content to take life at its face value may at any time have an experience which forces upon us these ultimate questions of the soul, and the Bible we need is a book which has provision within its broad covers for all these different kinds of needs. We need a Bible that will do, not simply for one age, or for one class, or for one race, but for all mankind, the Japanese and the Chinese and the Hindu and the South American, as well as the German and the Englishman and the American. And we need a Bible that will do for every century, not for the first simply or the second, but for the twentieth as well, and, what is quite as important for us now to remember, not for the twentieth

only but for the first and the second and all the centuries that lie between.

Now, the Bible that we have is a Bible of just this kind, for it gives us the record of a *progressive* revelation. And by that I mean a revelation which unfolds itself step by step in order to meet the varying needs of the varying stages in a growing and developing life. The Bible tells the story of the way in which God has been training mankind from infancy to mature manhood and womanhood. It is a book, therefore, in which you can find something for man at every stage in his moral and spiritual experience.

This does not mean, of course, that there are no fixed standards, that what is true for one man may be false for another. I shall have something more to say of this matter of standard in a moment. But it means that there are different aspects of truth and different methods of approaching it. It means that when I speak to children I must talk the language of children. It means that if I am talking to primitive men I must use ideas that lie within the range of their comprehension. Thus, if I find the biblical writers using conceptions of science and of history that our own age has outgrown, I must remember that they were speaking to men of their day and that if they had talked our language they could not possibly have been understood. I must ask myself what was the particular truth which they designed to teach at the time and see whether it be not one of which I can make use in dealing with some of my own people whose need is similar.

Now, I am far from thinking that this use of the Bible as a graded textbook, adapted to men of different stages of maturity, is a discovery of modern theology. All great preachers have used the Bible in this way, and this has been a chief source of their greatness, but what I mean is this, that the older view of the Bible rendered this use of it more difficult and less intelligent than the new. *Practically*, to be sure, the preacher used the Bible as a graded book, but in *theory* he conceived of it as designed from cover to cover for pupils of the highest grade. And the reason for this was that he had not yet gained the historic point of view.

This difficulty modern theology has removed, for it has taught us the steps through which our Bible came to be, and so showed us the uses which each part was designed to serve, not only for our day, but for its own. In doing this it has not only helped us to a better understanding of the Bible we know, but has recovered for spiritual use large sections of the book which but for its help would have fallen almost altogether into the background.

There is that old story of the creation which for so many years was the battleground on which the champions of religion and science waged interminable war. On the theory of inerrancy the story bristles with difficulties. It is, to say the least, exceedingly difficult to reconcile it with the modern view of the creation of the world. But if we read it historically in the light of the parallel creation stories of Babylonia and Assyria, we see for the first time its true significance. The picture of the world in the two accounts has striking similarities, but the conception of God is fundamentally different. In the Babylonian story, it is the strife of two rival monsters which is

responsible for the making of the world. But in the Bible, creation is due to an act of will. It is the fiat of that free Spirit who formed the world to be the scene of the redemptive purpose which was to culminate in Jesus Christ. "And God said, let there be light, and there was light." So read, the first chapter of Genesis remains for us today as truly revelation as ever it was in the past.

Or take an illustration of an altogether different kind. There is that great section of the Bible that lies between Isaiah and Malachi. When I was a boy all this part of the Bible was a sealed book to me. It was prophecy, and that meant that it was prediction. It was a part of the Bible in which God had foretold what was going to happen by and by in that great crisis lying somewhere in the future with which as a boy I as yet felt little concern. When I tried to read the prophecies I could not understand what they meant, and as I grew older and consulted the commentaries I was not much better off, for I found that each commentator had his own scheme for the interpretation of prophecy and that these schemes differed one from another.

Now, the scientific study of the Bible has helped us to a new understanding of these difficult passages, for it has shown that they have an entirely different meaning. They are not exclusively concerned with the future, as we had supposed. They have a present reference. The prophets were men of their own day, wrestling with specific evils, moral evils many of them, social abuses, economic wrongs, just the kind of questions that you and I face today as we pick up our newspapers and read of the last congressional investigation, or the last instance of the shameless flaunting of wealth. They were men, I say, who were facing a situation of this kind and who brought to bear upon it the principles of ethical religion, faith in the God who judges not by the outward appearance but by the heart, faith in the God who is not the God of Israel only, but the God of the whole world, the God who loves so much that he is not afraid to punish, the God whose will, however it may seem for the time to be thwarted, will in the end certainly prevail.

Here is a whole mine of homiletical material which has been opened to us by the studies of such men as George Adam Smith and others—just the kind of message that we need to bring home to an awakened conscience that is facing for the first time in its full meaning the fact of social wrong.

It is because Isaiah and Jeremiah are books of this kind that they are, in the highest and truest sense of the word, *prophecy;* just because they are concerned primarily with the needs of the present, the sins and the sufferings and the salvation of the men and women who were living at the time, do they furnish the most direct preparation for the Christ who was to come, the great Servant who went about doing good and who gave his life a ransom for many.

Or, suppose we take our illustration from the New Testament instead of the Old. How many of us there are who would be obliged to confess, if we were honest, that we had found the Epistles hard reading. We had been brought up —I know I was—to look upon such a book as Romans as a textbook of theology, dealing with such doctrines as original sin and justification by faith,

and we were not particularly interested in doctrine—doctrine, as such, I mean, doctrine in textbook form, divorced from life.

But modern theology is showing us that the divorce is only in our own minds. Instead of being theological treatises, Paul's letters are transcripts of his personal experience, bits of autobiography which give us an insight into the life-history of one of the greatest men who ever lived. They tell us of his struggle after righteousness and of his failure, of his agony and despair, of the amazing transformation which Christ wrought in his life, of the revolution which it brought about not only in his conduct but in his way of thinking, of his consecration of himself to the service of this new Master, and of his effort through long years of the most varied experience to interpret the gospel of Christ to men of different intellectual antecedents and social environment. They show us, in a word, a man facing the same kind of questions that confront us today; whose experience, therefore, can be practically helpful to us at the point where we most need help.

So in various ways the scientific study of the Bible is recovering for our use parts of the Bible which for many people had lost their meaning, and making them again what God designed them to be—practical helps in the solution of our present difficulties, and the answer to our present questions.

But this, after all, is only half the story. The Bible is necessary not simply to feed the individual. It has a social function as well, as the common standard by which the church is to test its Christianity. How far is the Bible of modern criticism effective here?

Let me recall again what is the nature of the test that we need. We need a test that will *actually work in practice*, a Bible that will really resolve the differences between Christians and bring them to a common mind. Now the difficulty with the old view of the Bible was that *as a matter of fact it did not do this*. Instead of uniting, it divided. Each man brought to the book his own presuppositions and standards; each group picked out from the multiplicity of material which the book contained that which appealed most to its own need, and by this judged the rest. What we need in a standard which is actually to work is some common principle which everyone recognizes and which is equally applicable in every case. Such a principle modern theology gives us in Christ. Christ, it tells us, is the key to the Bible. He is the common standard by which all its teaching is to be unified. When any question arises of interpretation, when it is a matter of judging with reference to the different grades of insight and of culture, of which we have been speaking, it is to him that we are to come as the final test. It is the old principle of Luther brought down to date: "The real touchstone by which all books are to be judged" is "whether they make much of Christ or not."

Here again I am far from thinking that this principle is a discovery of the new theology. In every age Christ has been central in Christian experience, and earnest men have turned to him for guidance in their perplexities, and help in their difficulties—in the Bible as elsewhere. What I mean is that the older view of the Bible rendered this resort less obvious and less certain. I have spoken

of Luther as using our principle, but this is only partly true. When Luther speaks of Christ, he uses the word in a general sense for whatever in the Bible met his need of salvation and forgiveness. He did not discriminate between the Christ of the Gospels and of the Epistles, or even of Old Testament prophecy. Indeed he could not, for he did not command the historic method which alone makes such discrimination possible.

When we use the term Christ today we do so in a more exact sense. We think of the Jesus of the Gospels, the historic figure whose life and death and resurrection the evangelists record, and to whose continued influence the Epistles witness. And when we say that Christ is our standard for interpreting the Bible, we mean that we must bring everything which it contains to the test of his life, teaching, and character.

This does not mean, of course, that we attach no value to those parts of the Bible which fall below Jesus' standard. What we have already said of the earlier stages of revelation should have made this abundantly plain. Still less does it mean that we are to admit nothing to our Bible which goes beyond the explicit teaching of Jesus. The high Christology of Paul and of John has its contribution to make to our theology, just as truly as the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son. Revelation did not stop when Jesus died. He explicitly declared that he had much to say to his disciples which they were not prepared to receive during his earthly life. He promised his Spirit to guide them into all truth, and in every age Christianity has shown itself the religion of freedom and of progress. But what is meant is that Jesus is central in the whole process of revelation. He is the test by which progress must be measured. Is it a question of what has gone before? We must ask how far it has prepared the way for him. Is it a question of what comes after? We must ask how far is it the legitimate unfolding of his principles.

I have spoken of the high Christology of Paul and John. At the heart of this Christology lies the conviction that in Jesus Christ we have to do with more than man. In him we see the revelation in human form of the unseen God who from the beginning has been seeking his erring children.

It is a conviction that has verified itself through centuries of Christian experience. But how shall we interpret to ourselves its full meaning? There are two possible ways that we may take. We may say, since Jesus is God incarnate, everything in his life that seems inconsistent with our thought of God must be explained away; or, we may say, since Jesus is God incarnate, every sweet and satisfying and adorable quality which he illustrated we may be sure is found in supreme measure in God. Can there be any question which of these two methods should be controlling in our interpretation of the Bible? Yet must we not recognize that it is a principle which has not always been given its full weight in the theology of the past?

To follow the applications of this principle would carry us too far, but I can perhaps make my meaning clear by an illustration. Suppose we compare the Bible to a tract of country through which the soul has to pass in its quest of truth and life. It has food in abundance to

nourish the soul in its quest, and beauty to delight the spirit, but there are also rough places to be traversed, and hills to be climbed.

What will the soul need if it is to make the journey successfully? Clearly, two things: light to see the way, and a path to point the direction.

Now, the older theology provided for the first of these needs in its doctrine of the witness of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the sun which lights up the dark places of the Bible and reveals to the soul their uses and their beauty. Without the witness of the Spirit no one can read the Bible understandingly, or respond to its appeal.

But the traveler needs more than light. He needs direction. He wishes to know not only what the country contains to supply his wants on the journey, but also which way to take to reach his goal. In other words, he needs a path.

Now, a path is not a prison. It is a way along which free men may walk erect. The charm of a path is that it opens vistas on every side and provides opportunities for digression to the right hand or to the left, as some new object of interest invites inspection. But the wise traveler will never stray too far, for he knows that if he does he may lose his way and so finally miss his goal.

So Christ gives us our direction as we journey through the Bible. He is the path from which it is never safe to stray far. All that the book contains is given us freely for our use and our enjoyment. He shows us how to use it aright, and how to enjoy it to the full.

This is the true meaning of that old doctrine of the infallibility of Scripture, which has been a stumbling-block to so many. By the infallibility of Scripture we do not mean simply that the book which lies before us on the table contains no mistakes. That is an altogether inadequate conception of the meaning of this great phrase. We mean that in this book, prepared by the Spirit of God for his church, we have a guide which, when read humbly, reverently, prayerfully, and in the spirit of Christ, will infallibly lead the individual and the church into the knowledge of that truth which they need to know. That is the only kind of infallibility which can do us any practical good. And that is the kind of infallibility which we actually have in our Bible.

May we not hope that when the critical movement, in the midst of which we stand, shall have run its course and we are able more clearly to distinguish its assured results from the shifting theories which are the inevitable accompaniment of any forward step on the road of human knowledge, the final result will be to leave us all with a profounder realization of the practical power and authority of the Bible; that as in the days of Luther it proved itself the book of freedom, leading men out from the yoke of a church which had grown corrupt and tyrannous into the liberty of the sons of God, so today it will show itself the book of unity, revealing to all of us who call ourselves Christians that common heritage of faith and hope and love which has been given to us by God in trust for all mankind?

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

THE GENERAL SITUATION

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON
Principal of the University of Chicago High School

Every father wants his boy to be better than himself. But he finds it easier to talk religion with his neighbors' children than with his own. Much moral instruction must therefore inevitably be given outside of the family. If such instruction can be given by a boy's teacher whom he loves and respects, it will be so much the better. The present series of articles by Professor Johnson are born of experience. Both the author and the editor of the "Biblical World" are anxious that their readers may comment upon them and make every sort of suggestion. The lessons which will follow this introductory paper will appear later in the form of a little textbook, to be used with classes of high-school boys. Suggestions as far as advisable will be embodied in the revised form.

The adolescent boy is the major problem of the Sunday school. It has not been difficult to make the work of the Sunday school seem interesting and worth while to both boys and girls up to the age of twelve or fourteen. It has been comparatively easy to hold the girls right on through the period of girlhood up to young womanhood. But with the boy from fourteen years up it is a different case. The physiological changes which take place at this time, of which the sudden rapid physical growth is the most obvious, are accompanied by more profound changes which affect his thought and conduct. The boy who has been docile and gentle suddenly becomes self-assertive and rough, ready to question the authority of teacher or parent. He craves action and if the restraints of school seem too severe, as is often the case, he rebels and will have no more of it if he can help it. Through legal enactment, the state keeps him in school up to a certain age, a sense of the value of an education as preparation for life's activities sometimes holds him longer, but statistics of school attendance show all too well how strong is the craving of the adolescent boy for what seems to him the freer life out of school. The Sunday school lacks the restraint of law and is unable to make effective the appeal of utility. The result is that at sixteen the boy begins to think he is getting too old for the Sunday school, and at eighteen most of the boys have disappeared.

Now we may assume at the outset that this unhappy outcome is not the fault of the boy. He is following out the laws of his own nature. Inability to understand the boy and meet his needs is the cause of the failure of the Sunday school in this regard. The

recent rapid increase in the enrolment of adolescent boys in the public schools has been due to changes in the methods and material of instruction from the point of view of the boy's present interests and future occupation. Similar adjustments of methods and material may be expected to secure corresponding results in the Sunday school.

A movement recently inaugurated by the Young Men's Christian Association for moral and religious education among high-school boys in Chicago and other cities promises excellent results. On the South Side of Chicago, at the Hyde Park branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, boys from three high schools meet each Wednesday evening from November to May. All sit down together at 6:15 for dinner and at 6:45 meet in separate rooms, the boys from each school with a teacher from the faculty of the school, for a discussion period of forty-five minutes. One of these classes has this year begun its eighth year under the same teacher, another, its fourth year, and the third, its second year. The number at dinner varies from sixty to more than a hundred, and the two oldest classes have had an average weekly attendance for the past two years of twenty-five or more boys.

The author has had a part in this interesting movement, having just begun the fourth year with the "Discussion Club" from his school. The membership of the club is thoroughly representative, having had for one year as its president a Catholic boy, and for another a Jewish boy. The author has placed entire responsibility for the attendance upon the officers and members of the club. In order to prevent any impression getting abroad in the school that one may secure favor with the principal by attending the meetings of the club, he has never invited a single boy to attend a meeting. It does not appear that the dinner is the chief attraction, because the boys pay for the cost of each meal and not infrequently come into the class discussion after the dinner is over. That the attendance has continued to increase from the first indicates that the real attraction is the discussions which constitute the chief activity of the club.

The important question at the beginning was what should be the material for class work. The author proposed the life of Jesus, the life of Paul, and the moral problems of the high-school boy, urging strongly the life of Paul as full of appeal to vigorous young boyhood. No objection was made to the use of New Testament material by the Jewish boys of whom there were several in the group, but it was the unanimous choice of the boys that we take up the discussion of the specific moral problems of boyhood instead of the lives of Jesus or of Paul which most of them had studied in Sunday school. *Life Questions of High School Boys* by Jenks was accordingly made the basis of our first year's work.

In the course of the year certain characteristics of adolescent boyhood came out distinctly. In the first place, boys are exceedingly fond of discussing whatever is of timely interest to them. Let an issue be placed before them, not as settled but as open to discussion, and boys will readily take sides and stoutly defend their position. And while some of their ideas will doubtless reflect their immaturity and lack of sound judgment, one may usually count on a larger degree of sincerity than is sometimes seen in the discussions of more mature men.

In the hands of a skilful leader, the discussions of a group of boys may almost always be brought to a satisfactory conclusion, which will have been greatly reinforced and made a vital force through the discussion from which it has finally emerged.

Again, boys have a tendency to respond to directness and frankness in kind. Your boy is a masterful bluffer if he thinks someone is trying to get an advantage and sometimes he becomes a bluffer from habit, but he will usually meet you half-way when it comes to a question of frankness and fair dealing. He will often prove a severe critic of himself or his social group. The customs and habits of his school or club he will discuss with absolute frankness so long as there is not involved anything that might be construed as telling on some other boy—"snitching" he will probably call it. He will talk frankly of his own habits and will sometimes surprise you by the intimate disclosures he will make.

Boys are thoroughgoing idealists. You are sure to find some of them who, from a discussion of the vital problems of boyhood, will come to feel themselves responsible for sweeping reforms among their fellows. This idealism, properly conserved and directed, may be made a factor of great value. Psychologists urge the importance of expression as a sequence of all good impressions. This is of first importance where we are dealing with concrete problems of daily conduct. So much of our religious and moral instruction spends itself in a momentary glow and does not translate itself into conduct, that it is of utmost importance that we strive to secure expression of what may otherwise end with the emotion aroused and leave the boy no better, perhaps worse off than before. It is difficult to estimate to what extent these impressions find expression, and one may easily hope for a more vigorous or speedy response than seems to come. It has been gratifying to observe, during the three years since the discussion club has been in existence, a steady improvement in the moral tone of the school in such matters as involve honesty in the relations of pupils with each other and with their teachers, respect for property rights, good sportsmanship, clean speech, which may be fairly traced in no small degree to the discussion of these topics. Tangible results may be seen in a written agreement entered into by a considerable number of boys not to tell "smutty" stories nor willingly to listen to such stories from others, an agreement which the writer did not suggest and of which he had no knowledge until after it had been made. One boy, to whom an improper suggestion had been made and repeated, promptly struck the offender a blow which laid him on the ground.

There are two factors of prime importance in the successful conduct of such a club or class—the leader and the material. The leader must be a boys' man, able to understand and appreciate the point of view of the boy, genuinely interested both in his sports and in his more serious activities, ready to spend time in thinking about the problems of boyhood and in actual contact with boys, desiring above all else that the boy may form right ideals and transmute these into habits of right conduct. He must not be over-eager to force his own mature ideas upon the boy, but must be willing to lead him to form his own ideas under tactful guidance.

The material should seem to the boy of direct and vital importance to him as a boy. It should not take the form of rules of conduct but should lead him to form such rules for himself. It must deal largely with concrete experiences taken from his own life. Much of it then will be local, drawn from his own school or community life. It will frequently be quite personal. To be most effective, it will sometimes be necessary to break away from an orderly sequence of topics in order to take advantage of some particular event or situation which could not be foreseen. Timeliness will then be an important consideration in the choice or order of material. It will cover, in the course of a year, all the issues that have to do with a boy's immediate relation to his fellows, to those in authority over him in school, in his home, in his community and state; it will deal with his relations to the various social and philanthropic agencies with which he may now or later have to do; it will include discussion of the various trades and professions to some one of which he will wish to devote his life successfully; and through it all there should run a fine religious spirit not dragged in forcibly, but natural and sincere, which should culminate in a discussion of a boy's relation to God and the organized agencies of religion.

This article began with some observations regarding the peculiar characteristics of adolescent boyhood and the partial or complete failure of the Sunday school to retain its hold upon boys in their middle and late teens, because it has failed to adapt its methods and materials to their needs. An experience of many years in teaching boys' classes and in the administrative work of the Sunday school has convinced the writer that such an adaptation of material to the pupil's needs as the public schools are successfully making would produce comparable results in the Sunday school. Much has been done in the reorganization of the curriculum to meet the needs of younger pupils. There are also some excellent books for older pupils, but there seems to be lacking material whose definite purpose is to deal with the vital, many-sided problems of the boy in his middle or later teens. The writer's experience here described has convinced him that such material, if available, would be of value.

In the following successive numbers of this magazine will be presented material for such a course which the writer has actually used with boys and has found effective in the manner above described. It is intended only as an outline to be filled out by class discussion. It is hoped that it will not seem for this reason scrappy and incomplete. The purpose is not to state conclusions, but to suggest discussions from which valuable conclusions may be drawn. If in some lessons there is no reference whatever to the Bible, it should be borne in mind that it does not purport to be primarily for Bible-study. Wherever the Bible furnishes material directly applicable to the subject under discussion, it is employed; no attempt has been made to introduce it at any other point. All the material will be found in accordance with the spirit of the teachings and life of Jesus and will be found most effective only as it is used in the spirit of the Great Teacher.

DIVORCE AND SOCIAL WELFARE

REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.
Philadelphia, Pa.

This outspoken article is the work of one of the leading Lutheran clergymen in America. It is profoundly significant in that it approaches the subject from the point of view of those who are day by day dealing with the actual moral conditions of life. Marriage and divorce are something more than a statistical problem. They concern human souls. We are under obligations to Dr. Delk for making this plain.

All institutions and laws find their justification for being in social welfare and the good of the individuals composing society. If the state is not essential for social welfare, then anarchism is a justifiable political theory. If the church does not enrich the moral and spiritual life of the people, then anti-ecclesiasticism becomes a virtue. If family life does not make for the happiness, stability, and culture of social life, then sexual promiscuity is justifiable. The state is not an end in itself, but exists for the protection of individual rights and the promotion of human welfare. The church is not an end in itself, but stands for spiritual culture, the propagation of religion, and social service. The family is not an end in itself, but exists for the ordered and lawful expression of love and the perpetuity of the race. Normal life begins, continues, and ends in the family. Monogamy is justified of her children. When any modification or serious change in family organization or life is proposed, we must insist upon its sure benefit to the social welfare. No immediate pleasure or profit to one or two individuals can count against the welfare and consequences to society at large. The main movement of modern history is the socialization of all life—industrial, political, commercial, and domestic. The first question then that we must ask concerning any social movement is, Will it, in the long run, result in the physical, moral, and affectional well-being of society as a whole?

The family is still the social unit. An attack on family life is a blow at social stability and health. There has been since the Protestant Reformation a marked growth in individualism. Up to a certain point, it has been a beneficent liberty. The individual does not exist for society, but society for the individual. Christianity, itself, has taught us the worth of the individual, and the Reformation set free the enslaved intellect and religious life of half Europe. Under the aegis of individualism the world has forged farther ahead in science, government, civil liberty, and industrial freedom than in the preceding thousand years of feudali m and ecclesiastical control. Modern industrialism has also accelerated the movement. No longer does the patriarchal type of family control play the part it did. The self-supporting sons and daughters of our land fare forth into professions, factories, and trade. The public-school system and the modern

newspaper have stimulated personal independence of thought and action. The right to be and to act as a distinct, self-directed individual is now the right of every person of age born into the modern world of America. But this valued individualism has bred a militant fight for liberty and rights without a corresponding sense of personal obligation and civic duty. The battle for personal privilege can only find its true peace and equilibrium in the socializing of desires and the consideration of the public good. The cry for personal emancipation and satisfaction is cruelly selfish unless controlled by an altruism which subjugates selfishness to a considerate love and social order.

It is only in the face of these obvious general principles of social welfare that we can sanely and truly discuss the modern movement of divorce. That there has been a startling increase in the number and percentage of divorces in the United States is a twice-told tale. By some it has been declared a healthy movement. I concede that there are facts in married and family life worse than divorce. Divorce is partly a social symptom. It points backward to marital infidelities, cruelties, and moral revulsions which are more repulsive and destructive of personal and social welfare than legal separations. But when the divorce movement attains to its modern proportions, as in the United States, we believe that personal, family, and social life is threatened and debased beyond palliation. In the year 1900 there were seventy-three divorces to every one hundred thousand of our population. Switzerland, which has the highest divorce rate of any European country, had thirty-two divorces to every one hundred thousand of population, which is about three-sevenths of the number reported for the United States. The highest rate of any country in the world obtains in Japan, and the next highest is found in the United States of America. One out of every twelve, possibly every eleven, marriages in this country now ends in divorce. When one stops to recall that the normal, the Christian marriage contemplates a union for life, surely we have reached a stage of acute marital unrest that provokes the question, "Is marriage a failure?"

Seven main legal causes, which practically throw wide the door to the widest license of judicial interpretation, now stimulate the demand for divorce. Adultery, cruelty, desertion, drunkenness, neglect to provide, combinations of preceding causes, conviction of felony, impotency, insanity, incompatibility of temper, and other causes are legal grounds in many states for annulling a physical, legal, social, and domestic relation, the most intimate and sacred known to mankind.

It is not my purpose in this paper to discuss the validity or wisdom of the laws—legal or ecclesiastical—relating to divorce. The value of such a discussion would be slight, for men will eternally differ, on both legal and religious grounds, as to the number of reasons for divorce. I have, I hope, a more fruitful purpose in mind. I believe we shall accomplish far more in the present situation if I can point out the real deep-seated causes which lie back of the legal reasons urged in ordinary procedures of our courts in this

increasing destruction of the marriage relation, and then indicate, if possible, certain factors and truths that will tend to check and correct our pitiful marital unrest and disruption of family life.

The most obvious and potent cause of divorce is indiscreet and hasty marriage. The old saw, "Marry in haste and repent at leisure," is a race experience packed into an aphorism. Marriage bases itself on sexual desire, but its heart and ideal is comradeship. A gusty and passionate courtship may furnish material for a romantic novel, but it is a poor foundation for the happy and abiding union of two lives. Now a genuine comradeship is not a status that can be discovered and established in a week or fortnight. It is not merely a matter of mutual admiration and taste, but roots itself in family, racial, and religious traditions plus personal temperaments. The assurance of comradeship requires the test of time and a large knowledge of individuality. A surrender to mere physical attraction, fine clothes, and delightful conversational powers is not the stuff of which enduring conjugal love is made. Thousands of marriages are ventured on nothing more than emotional impulse and blind faith. A young man and a young woman, total strangers to each other, meet at a summer resort, or a moving-picture show, and on the basis of good looks, perfervid promises of endless love and dreams of a prosperous future, they rush off, after a few months of acquaintance, to some magistrate or clergyman and gaily enter a relation the most intimate and solemn that two humans can create. After the first few weeks of married life they begin to discover that something more is needed than comeliness and theater tickets to keep the home bright, tidy, and warm. They find that their impulses and duties do not always coincide and synchronize; that they have ventured on a copartnership without a knowledge of the abilities or whims of the adored fiancé or lover; that, in a word, when life has settled down to a steady gait, the domestic responsibility becomes a tame trot and the golden glamor has paled to a serious demand for sacrifice and courageous cheer. Now average humanity, in order to exercise these fine moral qualities, must be truly mated in body, mind, and ideals of living in order to make real a true marriage. It is no wonder then that hasty marriages generally end disastrously. The young suitor should know that the prospective wife is a pure woman, possesses the ability to cook, sew, conduct a home, and sympathize in his life-work, and the prospective bride has a right to know the financial income, the social habits, the physical fitness, and the moral ideals of her future husband. Long engagements to marry may not be desirable, but they are infinitely better than a hurried courtship and the ghastly disillusionment that too often follows upon an indiscreet and hasty marriage. If young men and women pledged to marry would wait a few months or a year and get a sort of mental and emotional second breath before they make the final and irretrievable leap into matrimony, two-thirds of the divorce suits would be eliminated from our courts.

The second underlying cause for divorce which court records reveal is an economic one, i.e., non-support. The average wage of an American working-

man is less than a thousand dollars a year—indeed it is about six hundred and fifty dollars a year. It requires no mathematician or sociologist to see quickly that marriage on such a financial basis is a precarious affair. There is little "race suicide" among the families of the poor. A thrifty couple, willing to shut their eyes and ears to the alluring department-store windows, amusement halls, and garden dainties that fill our winter markets, can live on the eight hundred or thousand dollar wage or salary. But the average American school and factory girl, untrained in self-denial and household efficiency, is thrown into a panic of distress after marriage because of her inability to make her slender resources meet the demands of her growing household. Unless she can supplement her husband's income by some remunerative labor she quickly discovers she must relinquish certain luxuries, perhaps comforts, to which, as an unmarried girl, she had been accustomed. The ideals she had hoped to realize are taken down and buried one by one. The attempt to be hopeful and bright staggers and weakens. If sickness or non-employment overtakes the husband she is at her wits' end as to how to meet the doctor's bill and the grocer's statement. The poor little woman grows restive, perhaps a bit irritable, under the physical strain. A sigh, a half complaint, a dogged battle for contentment become part of her life experience. If her husband lacks in consideration and courage, if he should grow moody and reckless, if he takes to drink or grows tired of her fading comeliness, the way is soon opened for desertion and non-support. This is the common history which precedes in thousands of instances the long list of suits in divorce courts. Just what proportion of blame in such cases rests on our economic system and the lack of a just wage, and how far the weakness and cowardice of the man and wife are responsible for the pitiful breach between them is beyond our judgment. It is enough to know that desertion on the part of thousands of husbands is not due entirely to the infidelity or vixenish temper of incompetent wives, or the lust and laziness of the men themselves, but that we have an economic as well as a moral problem to face and solve if increasing divorce is to be prevented. A learned judge of Philadelphia, before whom a thousand such cases have been presented, has said that "rum and women" lie at the basis of all divorce. My learned friend must enlarge his series of causes in the dissolution of the marriage tie, for the hour has arrived when "a living wage" is the demand, not only of the men immediately interested, but of the best public opinion. To deny marriage by reason of small wages to men and women is to invite licentiousness and social chaos. We are dealing now with the fundamental sexual instinct, the implanted instinct of God, for the perpetuity of the race and man's best discipline; and to preach celibacy to average men and women, from a purely economic point of view, is a counsel of perfection and moral absurdity.

At the other extremity of the social scale we find a group of wealthy persons living in luxurious idleness. By reason of inherited wealth they escape from the ordinary work of life and spend time

—not their time but God's time—in a useless round of amusement and loitering at Palm Beach or the winter resorts of Europe. While in their native cities some club, or hotel palmroom, is made the headquarters. Their time is spent at bridge whist, or dallying after an opera in some smart café where cocktails and cigarettes form the chief diversion. Time hangs heavily; time must be killed somehow, and time takes its revenge and hands over these useless, luxurious, sporting creatures to the devil, to ennui, and the daring flirtations of secret motor trips and wayside inns. Old wives grow tame and are discarded for new beauties of the stage or street. The passion for admiration, jewels, physical comfort, emotional thrills, the satisfaction of some new conquest not of the heart but of the body, make the ordinary domestic and social pleasures of life plebeian and flat. Erotic novels, risqué repartee, indecent bodices, and flaming indiscretions all lead up to the decay of love and of regard for early marriage vows, and the man and the corespondent are ready for any infamy and the divorce court. Nature will have her revenge. The law of labor and social service rests upon all men, rich and poor. To repudiate these fundamental conditions of health, social stability, and character is to prepare a pathway to a hell of selfishness and corruption. The idle rich are a curse to themselves and society. We have noble and useful rich men and women in America. We have and we need a class exempt from the ordinary toil and moil of industry and commerce who shall be leaders and patrons in art, music, science, exploration, philanthropy, and religion. This group is not the object of our indictment. It is that silly, ignorant, presumptuous, animalized, parasitic group of idle men and women who batten on the moral weaknesses of one another, and who yet claim the position of social leaders; who are both victimized and the seducers of girlhood and manhood; these are the derelicts, the real flotsam and jetsam of society, that should be whipped into some worthy service or branded as incorrigible, moral idiots. For such creatures true marriage is impossible. They are foredoomed to divorce and destruction.

The next cause I desire to present as creating that atmosphere in which divorce becomes progressively easy is the feminist movement. With much in the modern movement for the emancipation of women I am in heartiest agreement. Looking back fifty years to the status of women in Europe, and even in the United States, one sees restrictions and unnatural limitations under which they lived, which now are seen to be unnecessary and unjust. Educational, social, political, professional privileges, which we now consider the inherent right of every individual, irrespective of condition or sex, were then denied to women. We understand now the defiant note of Ibsen in *A Doll's House*, voicing for the Scandinavian peoples woman's plea for individuality in the marital relation. Julia Ward Howe, Olive Schreiner, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, and a score of other women have made clear woman's right and capacity for self-direction and equal legal privilege. But the movement has gone far beyond the boundary of legitimate claims for self-expression and

public privilege. It has taken on, in some quarters, a rank license and riot of expression, in both literature and life, which threatens the moral and legal status of whole nations. In the realm of literature claiming to be scientific and philosophical we have such writers as Freud and Ellen Key, who are claiming that all motherhood is sacred within or without the marriage bond. Ellen Key in her book, *Love and Marriage*, says: "Few propositions are so lacking in proof as that monogamy is the form of sexual life which is indispensable to the vitality and culture of nations. . . . . Monogamy, which was a custom long before the introduction of Christianity, became injurious as well as beneficial to true sexual morality, from the moment the church prescribed it as the only form of this morality" (p. 7). "Only cohabitation can decide the morality of a particular case; in other words, its power to enhance the life of the individuals who are living together and that of the race. This sanction can never be granted in advance nor, with certain exceptions relating to children, can it be denied to any matrimonial relationship. Each fresh couple, whatever form they may choose for their cohabitation, must themselves prove its moral claim" (p. 17). "The solution can only be this, that we not only assert love's freedom to unite without external tie, but also man's right more fully than at present to loosen the tie, when real union is no longer possible" (p. 347).

The underlying claim made by this school of social philosophers is that *erotic love is the sole moral ground of marriage;* that when love dies down or out, either or both parties are morally bound to separate and remarry if some new affinity swings into the ken of the disappointed spouse. Marriage is thus conceived as a matter of unfettered choice. It has not the dignity of even a legal contract, much less any sacramental quality entailing the idea of a life-long union. One wonders if some of these radical theorists would themselves make the actual ventures in society they champion for others. Or, still more startling, if this glorification of the erotic note in marriage were the controlling principle, what would become of society as a whole? That love, erotic love, is the basis of the marital relation may be granted, but to posit it as the sole moral basis of marriage is to eliminate the highest and most spiritual factors of personality and give encouragement to a selfish emotionalism which turns to fresh pastures whenever some alluring personality calls louder than one's present mate. Erotic love needs a curb, a higher law than sexual affinity. If the man and woman were the only persons concerned in a marriage, then free divorce would be the logical sequel of "free love," but there is a third party in every such situation which must be considered and consulted before the bond can be safely broken, i.e., society—society organized as the state. The dependent, distracted children of such a union, and the influence of such leasehold marriage upon others must be reckoned with. This preachment of "the new morality" has reached our own libraries and lecture platforms in America and must be met and answered by a race experience and the wisdom of ethical teachers whose balanced

vision and personal self-control fit them to be the real prophets of the present and the future. The claim of the deterministic school that men and women are not responsible for their passions and their gratification will not stand justified before the bar of common-sense.

Here and there some hysterical soul is found in revolt against our divorce laws because they are "man-made"—meaning that they were framed by persons who happened to be men, implying that justice is impossible so long as men write statutes, and revealing that sex antagonism which threatens to make of the militant suffragette movement a crazy fiasco, degrading the worthy movement of the enfranchisement of woman. This is feminism run to hopeless hysteria.

The underlying cause of divorce in many countries is the complete secularization of life. The loss of religious faith and the consequent decline in spiritual ideals have combined to release that pagan attitude toward all life which sleeps but is never quite conquered in the human mind and soul. We are now reaping the aftermath of late nineteenth-century materialism. Here and there a leader of thought, many men whose science stopped with physical phenomena, and thousands of the working classes benumbed with toil and isolated from the church, have preached and practiced a purely animal —a "hog philosophy," as Carlyle would say, and the sense of any spiritual quality or divine authority in marriage has been entirely lost for them. Secularism has ridiculed the church and taken all authority into its own hands in this matter of marriage. Life has had its revenge, for we cannot evacuate life of spiritual ideals and religious sanctions and preserve social peace and happiness. Moral faiths in marriage as elsewhere must be based on spiritual convictions. Spiritual convictions are justified only on the basis of some spiritual object and authority. When the belief that a pure and holy Person is the primal creative force—the divine authority in all morals and religion—perishes in a human heart, then it is ready for any revolt against any institution which declares: Thou shalt not kill, or Thou shalt not commit adultery. It is noteworthy that such is the situation today in many lives; not that the religious sense has perished, but that the religious sanction has grown pale and inoperative as a controlling force in social life. Marriage has become for a great part of society a purely secular affair, unrelated in any way to God, religion, or divine law. Christianity is a conservative force. It does hold aloft a high ideal of marriage. The beastly side of human nature is in revolt against the restrictions to divorce laid down by Jesus. When therefore the spiritual sense is blunted and a man or woman is in hot revolt, all strictures become odious and the higher moral status is sacrificed to animal passions. The laws that man makes he can modify or break with slight compunction. Only when laws are based in the eternal nature of God do they command and control a man seeking to make his happiness the paramount concern of his life. If I believed that this secular, materialistic conception of life would go on increasing, then any hope of checking the growth of the

divorce evil would perish forever. But I believe there shall be a return to the spiritual, religious point of view on the part of the children of present apostates from Christ's attitude toward divorce. Indeed, apart from the church, leaders of thought are arising who, disclaiming all allegiance to theology and organized religion, are preaching an ideal of marriage which is as spiritual and rigid in its demands for self-discipline and devotion as we find even within the Roman Catholic church. Just now I have in mind the book of Dr. F. W. Foerster, special lecturer in ethics and psychology at the University of Zurich. In his work, *Marriage and the Sex Problem*, there is sounded a note of warning and recall to a stern and fine ideal of personal control in the marriage relation. This keen student of life and history makes plain that freedom without authority means anarchy in all social life, that love without law is license, that the material and erotic side of marriage breeds only weakness and disgust unless balanced by an unselfish and spiritual ideal of the relationship. It strikes one oddly to see a chapter headed "The Indispensability of the Ascetic Ideal" in a book written from the standpoint of a psychologist and social philosopher. Though these occasional voices are a source of hope and rejoicing to us who are seeking to create a higher point of view than naturalism, there are other vital correctives of the present tendency to loose divorce which we must now consider if any radical check is to be given to our slipshod methods of dealing with the situation.

Needed Remedies for Divorce

First in the order of our consideration of remedial reforms is placed uniform marriage and divorce laws. If in America we had to deal with one central legal authority, many of our political, industrial, and domestic problems would be much more readily solved. But so long as we have forty-eight independent commonwealths jealous of state prerogatives and historically the creators and custodians of the laws most intimately touching the life of the people, our legal problem becomes much more complex. It is perfectly apparent that so long as there are a dozen different points of view concerning the eligibility of parties to matrimony and thirty different points of view as to grounds of a valid divorce, men and women may slip out of their own state and find some Gretna Green and blinking official to furnish a license to wed, and then after six months of dissolving bliss they may escape to still another state and after the brief residence of one or of both, find a pliant court to find justification for the dissolution of their lightly worn bondage. To begin with, if the marriage laws of all our states demanded a publication of the banns or the printing of the application for a marriage license at least one month before the proposed ceremony, it would give the youthful ardent couple a chance to cool to the point of rationality and the parents an opportunity to recall the family record of births and gauge the suitability of the maid or man for wife and husband. One-half of the nation's divorces would be prevented if the hasty, indiscreet, clandestine marriages were eliminated.

The legal demand for one month's public announcement of intention to marry would be a great deterrent to such precipitancy and fraud. The old-fashioned reading of the banns from the pulpit prevented many a bitter life-mistake and gave dignity to the engagement to marry. Something of the same publicity, using the daily press as the pulpit for such proposed marriages, would work a beneficent revolution in hasty marriages which so frequently end in the divorce court.

Uniform divorce laws are still more necessary in order to check the volume of divorces in the United States. The Committee on Resolutions of the Divorce Congress which met in Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia in 1906, drafted the following law so far as relates to jurisdiction:

All suits for divorce should be brought and prosecuted only in the state where the plaintiff or the defendant had a bona fide residence.

When the courts are given cognizance of suits where the defendant was domiciled in a foreign jurisdiction at the time the cause of complaint arose, it should be insisted that relief by absolute divorce will not be given unless the cause of divorce was included among those recognized in such foreign domicile.

Where jurisdiction for absolute divorce depends upon the residence of the defendant, not less than two years' residence should be required on the part of the defendant who has changed his or her state domicile since the cause of divorce arose.

Each state should adopt a statute embodying the principle contained in the Massachusetts act, which is as follows: "If an inhabitant of this commonwealth goes into another state or country to obtain a divorce for a cause which occurred here while the parties resided here, or for a cause which would not authorize a divorce by the laws of this commonwealth, a divorce so obtained shall be of no force or effect in this commonwealth."

There are two reflections in the consideration of divorce decrees which it is well to recall. The first is made by George Walter Smith, Esq., of the Philadelphia bar, who said, in an address given before the Ohio Bar Association in 1909: "The status of matrimony may be stripped of its incidents by the municipal law, but no decree of any court or act of legislature can restore the natural status of one who has been married to that of one who never has been married. Life is full of finalities and, as has been finely said, there is something tragic in everything that is final." It is well also to reiterate the testimony given in the majority report of the Divorce Commission of England made last year: "No witness has been able to tell us of a country where, as the result of greater facility for the dissolution of marriage, public morality has been promoted, the ties of the family, of husband and wife, of parents and children have been strengthened and home life has been made purer and more settled."

I place as the next corrective of the divorce movement a single standard of sex morality for men and women. The dual standard of sex morality bases itself in the ages when physical might, together with a sense of ownership of the wife, were the dominant factors in marriage. Men claimed sexual license just because they were men with a man's prerogative to rule, make laws, and capture prey. Men may be more

impulsive and aggressive in their sexual nature than women, but the whole movement of Christian civilization has been in the emergence of the rational and moral control of the instinctive passions. A new day has dawned in thought and life of mankind, and now we talk of fallen men as well as of fallen women. A truer physiology and scientific therapeutics have exploded the old ideas of innocuous premarital indulgence and the nature of the diseases consequent upon vice. Good men demand of themselves the same standard of chastity that they expect from a future wife. Let good men and women also demand of others that both sexes be tried by the same single standard of purity. If, in social circles, the roué and the tainted applicants for the hands of our daughters were refused the handshake and social recognition they crave, they would quickly wake up to their real character and condition and amend their ways precipitately. A certificate given by a reputable physician certifying to freedom from venereal diseases on the part of the man and woman is a legitimate demand to be made by a father or clergyman who is requested to sanction a marriage. Not until we attain to this heroic treatment of our male moral defectives can we look for any great advance in the movement toward marital fidelity and happiness.

As an aid to the solution of the divorce problem Chicago has set the country a good example in the establishment of a Court of Domestic Relations. A great deal of primitive ignorance, pig-headedness, and ugly circumstance go to cause separations between men and women once happily married. Suspicion breeds suspicion, anger provokes anger, and stubborn silence further estrangement. When a husband and wife have reached the breaking-point and resort to divorce procedure in an ordinary court, their purpose is often achieved. Many a time some kindly inquiry and strong, frank advice on the part of a judge would awaken an intelligent view of the situation and arouse the better nature of the alienated man and woman. The question of publicity in divorce procedure has been advocated as a great deterrent in checking divorce, but neither publicity, which contaminates the public mind through a sensational press, nor reference of the case to a master can have the corrective note which is an essential in preventing decrees of divorce and in securing the reconciliation of estranged husbands and wives. After all, men and women are but children of a larger growth, and the firm, kind hand of a court familiar with human weaknesses would save many homes from wreck and children from demoralization.

I am quite sure that much marital infidelity springs out of improper housing conditions. Where men, women, and children are huddled together, two or three families to a section of a floor, having no privacy in dressing or conveniences of a true home life, breathing under-vitalized air, and irritated by the friction of uncongenial contacts, the moral tone sags, intimacies are forced upon girls and women, with a stolid recklessness of public opinion, all of which prepare the conditions for immoral living. The owners of these unfit domiciles should be halted in their penurious rentals, and proper space, sufficient toilets, and pure air be enforced

by city inspection. A certain amount of instruction in sex should be given to boys and girls by parents and later instructors, but after all it is not an elaborate physiological knowledge of the sex problem, but a fuller general education, the toning-up of the whole personality of our youth, which is the crying need of the hour. Air space and physiological charts cannot take the place of a vision of purity and a will that can say "No" to any solicitation. Just now we are forcing a knowledge upon young people that is fit only for a venereal clinic, when what is needed is a sense of shame and devotion to high ideals of purity.

At base, we need a true conception of marriage. Instead of considering marriage as a matter of mere consent, to be annulled at the wish of the husband or wife, indeed, going beyond the idea of a purely legal contract sanctioned and annulled by the state, we shall have to recover the sacramental conception of marriage before any deep and abiding improvement is secured. I do not believe marriage is technically a religious sacrament, but I do believe in the sanctity of marriage, that it reaches up into a higher spiritual realm than the mutual consent of the two immediately involved, higher than a human contract approved by the state, that in a word it has its deepest sanction, its firm foundation, and highest experiences in the religious consecration of two souls whose life is given and judged by Almighty God. The Roman Catholic church has preserved the right ideal of the marriage relation, but has been needlessly severe in denying the dissolution of such a relation when every sanctity of the relation has been blasted by infamous adulteries. Christ's dictum on divorce was not suggested for legislation, but as the ideal and status of the subjects of his Kingdom. Let us emulate the Roman Catholic ideal but avoid her refusal of any divorce and her back-stairs methods in granting the annulment of unhappy marriages on the grounds of ecclesiastical irregularities. Let us exalt the Christian ideal of a lifelong union. Protestantism must not, cannot go to the lengths of civil courts in the acceptance of causes of divorce and the consequent freedom of remarriage. Our sympathies may go out to many unhappy husbands and wives who are mentally and affectionally dissevered, but their good and the good of society will not be accomplished by quick and easy divorce. Many a wounded woman and heartbroken husband have recovered the early relation of fellowship and trust by a patient, heroic bearing of disrupting ills. The discipline of temper, mutual burden-bearing, the forgiving heart, the self-sacrificial note, are the inner necessity of any marital intimacy and domestic life. Not in frivolity and the air of coarse jokes, not in a defiant spirit of individualism dare human souls approach marriage, but rightly curbing all selfish animalism and pledging souls as well as bodies, let all those who enter into this estate enthrone their love beside the constant, holy life of God. Then the pledged hearts made pure and strong by the indwelling Son of God shall change the first hot vows of youth to a psalm of praise to Him who made of twain, one life of faithful, deathless love.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE RELIGION OF THE HEBREWS AND MODERN SCHOLARSHIP. IV

J. M. POWIS SMITH

IV. The Value of Hebrew Religion

The aim of this final study is to discover what, in the opinion of the scholars themselves, is the result of the application of critical methods as they affect the religion of Israel. Is the Old Testament a more or less valuable book than before the modern point of view became regnant? The same general answer is presented by all of the authors selected for study; but the variations of viewpoint and of vision within this general agreement are by no means insignificant. The books chosen are: (1) G. Adam Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* (1901); (2) W. G. Jordan, *Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought* (1909); (3) A. White Vernon, *The Religious Value of the Old Testament* (1907); and (4) H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* (1913).

George Adam Smith constitutes an excellent guide for the start. The spirit of his work is entirely irenic and, what is of more importance, the whole discussion breathes an atmosphere of true religion. It is quite clear that Professor Smith cares as much about the religious significance of the Old Testament as does the most anxious of his readers. Further, if any man knows how to preach from the Old Testament with power, surely George Adam Smith does. His expositions of the prophets, in the *Expositor's Bible*, are unsurpassed in expository preaching upon the Old Testament. The theme he selected for these lectures to the Divinity School of Yale University was an eminently fitting one.

The best two lectures are those on "Immortality" and on the "Preaching of the Prophets to Their Own Times." Here the consciously apologetic attitude is less conspicuously present than elsewhere and the strictly historical and interpretative attitude is correspondingly more in evidence. The least satisfactory chapters are the two on the "Proof of a Divine Revelation" and the "Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament." In the very nature of the case revelation cannot be proved; very little that is of great worth can be so conclusively demonstrated. As to the spirit of Christ, it seems sometimes as though Dr. Smith was a little too eager to make out a case.

Suffice it now to throw out some questions provocative of thought for the readers of the book. Jesus is claimed as our chief authority for the value of the Old Testament. Is this a truly

historical position? Can the value of a collection of literature be made dependent for us upon the judgment of anyone but ourselves? What would a Jew say to Jesus as the chief authority on this matter? Is not the self-evidencing power of the truth itself the best authority?

Is it sufficient for the historical student to say that the only explanation of Israel's monotheism is to be found in revelation, or that Israel's knowledge of God was due to the authentic, personal action of God himself? How were that action and that revelation mediated? Did God reveal himself through normal, everyday experience or are we to think of some exceptional inroad into consciousness?

The lectures everywhere represent the activity and influence of Yahweh, or God, in a very objective and tangible fashion. Indeed, in this respect, they are truly biblical. Does this mean that the world of Old Testament times was in different relationship to God from the modern world? Or should we revise our whole attitude of mind and speak of the activity and influence of God today in the same personal and objective way?

As a matter of fact, is not the art of preaching from the Old Testament in the light of historical study a much more difficult one than it was when the proof-text method was all-sufficient? In order to present an Old Testament message effectively, it is necessary nowadays to reproduce for the listening people the situation out of which the message came and to show the points of contact between that age and our own and the consequent adaptation of the prophetic message of former times to our own times. All this calls for much time and hard study; but the investment of energy yields large returns. No better models for this kind of preaching can be found than those of George Adam Smith himself.

Professor Jordan's book has the same practical aim as Principal Smith's, as is shown by its subtitle, *The Place of the Old Testament Documents in the Life of Today*. The first nine chapters present a general summary of the results of the application of critical methods to the documents of the Old Testament. The last five attempt an evaluation of these results from various points of view. In general, the attitude and spirit of this book are less restrained than is the case with the work of Principal Smith. Jordan's critical movements are not fettered. He sees that the only proper procedure is to encourage criticism to do her perfect work, leaving theology and religion to adjust themselves to the facts that are thereby revealed, whether such adjustment should involve enrichment or impoverishment. For himself, however, Jordan is perfectly satisfied that the critical treatment of the Old Testament means in practically every way much gain.

Jordan furnishes an excellent introduction to many phases of Old Testament study. He approaches the subject from many different angles. He pays much attention, especially in the appendix, to the works of many scholars and gives quite an extended selection of bibliography. His criticism of the late Professor Orr's attack upon the critical school is keen and thoroughgoing. His reply to the charge that archaeology

has overthrown criticism is equally satisfactory and his treatment of the so-called Pan-Babylonian question is eminently sane. In his presentation of the "struggles and survivals" in Hebrew religion, it may be doubted whether he has given sufficient weight to the evidence for the existence of ancestor-worship and the survival of human sacrifice in Israel as a part of Yahweh-worship. Setting forth the effect of criticism upon the preacher's task, he emphasizes the fact that the correct homiletical use of the Old Testament is much more difficult than it was upon the older systems of interpretation; but it is correspondingly more fruitful.

Does Jordan, however, go the whole distance? Is not the Old Testament, in reality, merely the record of the religious experience of one small section of the human race? Must we not approach it and evaluate it more consciously from the comparative point of view? Has God confined himself at any time in human history to any one people? Has he not made himself known in the experience of all men? Can we speak of "revelation" in Israel and deny it elsewhere? If the "revelation" of God is universal, what differentiates one "revelation" from another? Must not the religion of the Hebrews be judged solely upon its merits without regard to any theory as to its origin? In the light of such questions, is the Old Testament rightly esteemed as the record of the richest and most inspiring religious experience of pre-Christian ages?

In turning to Dr. Vernon's little book, let these questions be kept well in mind. It will be noted that this writer speaks from the standpoint of "the most outspoken modern scholarship" and that he believes that it "ministers to our religious needs and to the appreciation of the supreme religious value of the Old Testament." This is surely all that could be desired. The three chapters on the older view of the Old Testament set forth in clear incisive phrase and with keen insight its value, its defects, and its untenability. We may differ from Dr. Vernon in some of his judgments; for example, is prediction adequately described as an expression of "the moral insight of majestic men who spoke as they were moved, not by a magic, but by the Holy, Ghost"? Is ritual always "an evidence of religious stagnation"? Was it really so in Hebrew religion? But in the main, Dr. Vernon's verdict will command the approval of modern scholars.

In the exposition of the contribution of the modern view of the Old Testament, Dr. Vernon selects three elements for emphasis. In general, they are all included in the fact that the Old Testament shows us the making of our religion. We are brought by it into sympathetic contact with the great discoverers of religious truth and power. We see how they learned of God and righteousness, and we discover that there was no mysterious element in their experience, save such as is common to man. We are thus given a glimpse of the possibilities for religious growth and attainment that lie within reach of our own and of every generation. We too can further the cause of religious progress. We discover also that these great souls wrought out their religious experience in the midst of commonplace duties and nerve-racking problems that were

of the same sort as those amid which we live. It was by this very process of struggle and toil that strength for achievement was developed. Such a reading of the Old Testament means to many men a new revelation of God and of the glory of living.

A few words must be said to call attention to Robinson's *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament.* This book belongs naturally with the first of our four studies, but it has only just been received from the publisher. The title indicates its method, which is to take up one by one the great religious ideas and study them in their historical development. This has some advantages; for we are thus enabled to concentrate our attention upon any given idea. It has also disadvantages; for we can properly appreciate an idea only when it is brought into closest contact with all of the related ideas and circumstances which went into its shaping. It also involves somewhat of repetition. The last chapter of this book gives a fresh statement of the "permanent value of the Old Testament," which adds something to the statements we have already considered. The appendix gives a carefully selected list of books on each chapter of the text. The book as a whole is well worth reading and is of the sort to be appreciated by any man of intelligent culture.

Other works discussing the value of the old Testament are:

J. E. McFadyen, *Old Testament Criticism and Christian Church* (1903).

C. F. Kent, *The Origin and Permanent Value of the Old Testament* (1906).

W. C. Selleck, *The New Appreciation of the Bible* (1907).

M. Dods, *The Bible, Its Origin and Nature* (1905).

J. M. Thomas, *The Christian Faith and the Old Testament* (1908).

E. Kautzsch, *Die bleibende Bedeutung des Alten Testaments* (1903).

Whatever we may think of the legitimacy of the historical method in general, or the various specific applications made of it, the fact is indisputable that by reason of it a new interest has been aroused in the Bible. Never before was there such activity in Bible-study and interpretation as these modern days and modern methods have developed. The results of excavation and exploration have been laid hold of with avidity and utilized gratefully and effectively in the illumination of the written word. Scholarship of the highest rank has been laboriously attained and unstintingly poured out upon the interpretation of the Bible. Biblical interpretation has been raised to the level of other humanistic studies and needs not to hang its head in shame among its brethren. The new view of the Bible and its significance has taken hold of the mind of the church. The modern Christian or Jewish scholar is eager to know all that can possibly be discovered by any method regarding the origin and character of his sacred books. Some have pursued scholarly research for the purpose of defending dearly cherished dogmas; others have sought thereby to gain new conceptions of Scripture and of Scripture's God; from both sides has come much gain in every way to the cause of the science of biblical interpretation.

For the modern man, the great blessing of modern historical study is that it

has given him a new Bible. This Book of Books, as he still, with full understanding, calls it, has been brought down out of the clouds and been found to have been deeply rooted in human experience. Its words come to the historical student with new significance. For he sees how they were at times wrought out in the furnace of affliction and at other times wrung from the souls of men tossed about by the same billows of doubt that buffet him. The Bible has been made a more human book, and not one whit less divine. The religion of the Bible has come to be recognized as the finest product of the religious experience of a great people. It thus comes to the modern man as an inspiration and a challenge. Men of old sought after God and found him and out of that search they spoke burning words to their fellows. The same possibilities and opportunities for the knowledge of the divine will and for the interpretation of it in terms of our present problems are available to the men of today. From the way in which the spiritual heroes of the Hebrews faced their problems and solved them for their times, men may obtain invaluable inspiration and guidance for the conduct of the work of the world today.

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS[1]

With this study we come to the close of Paul's visible ministry and to those final messages which show his tender solicitude for all those who had been his faithful friends, and for those larger groups which we have since his day denominated the "churches" which he organized.

Paul in prison, writing these latest letters, or the letters upon which they were based, was no less vigorous a fighter than when facing the perils of difficult journeys or threatening mobs.

But to plant Christianity was one thing, to preserve it another. The Judaizers had not ceased to work. Even more subtle was the danger that the followers of Jesus should regard Christianity as a philosophical system rather than a vital life, and that different types of Christianity should split the church into small and ineffective parties, losing sight in intellectual quibbling of the real message of salvation from sin through faith in Jesus Christ.

And greater than even these intellectual dangers were those deep-seated habits of life which the heathen religions not only countenanced but encouraged, habits individual and social which choked spirituality and defeated that control of oneself and one's powers which Paul so earnestly sought to exalt.

Paul was fully conscious of all these dangers. Yet his letters show no fear that Christianity will be lost to the world. Such a result his faith could not permit. But rather he labored with his last breath to contribute his share to the progress of the new religion, glorying in his opportunity to serve his master in a cause that must triumph.

[1] The suggestions relate to the fourth month's work, the student's material for which appeared in the *Biblical World* for December and may be obtained in pamphlet reprints for use with classes. Address: The American Institute of Sacred Literature, The University of Chicago.

It is this Paul which the class should find pictured in the letters which we shall study this month. Not less also the man who as the years passed reincarnated in his own character to a marvelous degree the traits of Jesus, the Christ.

Program I

Leader: (1) Ancient philosophies and their menace to Christianity, or (2) Enemies of Christianity in the first century —Judaizers, philosophers, social ideals.

Members: (1) Paul in prison, his activities, his interests, his friends. (2) Paul's ideals of Christian character as impressed upon the Colossians. (3) What we know of the Christians at Ephesus and Paul's relation to them. (4) Paul's ideal of a Christian household: Is it practical?

Subject for discussion: Paul's Christian armor and what it saved him from. Did it voice Paul's experience or his theory?

Program II

Leader: A résumé of what he considers to be Paul's great contribution to the progress of Christianity.

Members: Discuss the following questions: (1) If Paul's letters had been lost would Christianity have been lost? (2) In what ways does the historical study of Paul's letters enhance their value to us? (3) Paul discoursed very fully upon all phases of Christian conduct. Are any of his ideals incompatible with present modern social and religious conditions? Give examples. (4) The meeting may well close with recitations of choice sayings of Paul and comments upon them.

REFERENCE READING

Weinel, *St. Paul*, chaps. xxiii, xxiv; Bacon, *The Story of Paul*, Lects. 9, 10; Wrede, *Paul* (entire volume); Gilbert, *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, §§ 148–50; Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, chap. xxvii; Weizsacker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, II, pp. 137–47; McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, pp. 396–439; Gilbert, *Students' Life of Paul*, chap. xv; Ramsay, *Pictures of the Apostolic Church*, pp. 379–92; Johnston, *St. Paul and His Mission to the Roman Empire*, chap. xiii; Robertson, *Epochs in the Life of Paul*, pp. 285–319; Bacon, *Making of the New Testament*, pp. 103–12; Peake, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 47–72; Bacon, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 126–40; Julicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 125–47, 174–200; Moffatt, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 161–76, 373–420; Ramsay, *St. Paul, the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*, pp. 360–62; Burton, *Handbook on the Life of Paul*, pp. 71–82; Burton, *Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age*, § 69; other lives of Paul by Stalker, Farrar, and Bird.

See Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, 4-volume or 1-volume edition, for articles on Paul the Apostle, Colossae, Epistle to the Colossians, Ephesus, Epistle to the Ephesians, Timothy, First Epistle to Timothy, Second Epistle to Timothy, Titus, Epistle to Titus, Philemon, Epistle to Philemon.

CURRENT OPINION

The Social Function of Religion

C. A. Ellwood, in the *American Journal of Sociology* for October, declares that fundamentally religion and science are not in conflict with each other. The man of science should believe in religion as he believes in education. True, the metaphysical validity of religious concepts has not been demonstrated. But it is equally true that the principles of education have not been metaphysically vindicated. Just as the man of science recognizes the positively ascertainable facts of education, so he should take cognizance of the positive aspects of religion in relation to society.

Now, what is this religion? Religion cannot be identified with any of its historical forms, nor with mythology and theology. Religion has its roots in the whole nature of man. Consequently, his emotional and willing sides, as well as his intellectual aspect, must be considered. Briefly put, according to Professor Ellwood, "*religion is belief in the reality of spiritual life.* It is essentially an emotional, a valuing attitude toward the universe; it is the attitude which projects mind, spirit, life with all things" (pp. 293 f.). The domain of religion is in the realm of values. These values are acquired by religion socially. Its concepts of deity, of soul, and of responsibility can be accounted for socially; they are objectifications of social consciousness.

The function which religion renders to society may be briefly indicated thus: Religion has been a great force in the conservation of social values. Society gives birth to social values and institutions, and religion sanctions them and acts as their guardian. These values are conserved by religion from one age to another. Moreover, religion performs its social function by fostering the progress of social values and ideals. It actively engages in the production of social values. And lastly, religion, in the higher stages of culture, calls on individuals for the attainment of social value. "The supreme rôle of religion in the higher stages of human culture is to enforce the claim to dominance in the life of man of the ideal of social values" (p. 302). In view of the fact that religion exercises such great function in society and that it wields power for good or evil, religion must be wisely guided in order that it may render the best possible service to society. Professor Ellwood holds that the only religion which is adapted to modern age is a religion of humanity, a religion which will put the service of man above all other ends and values.

Philosophy of Religion as an Independent Study

Mr. F. R. Tennant, in the *Expositor* for September, after showing that the philosophy of religion has become an independent branch of study, points out the subject-matter of this investigation. This branch of modern investigation deals with religion or religions; it is concerned with all forms of religion as its subject-matter. As special aspects of philosophy of religion, the writer names the practical and the theoretical matters. The practical side of it considers the various ethical systems of religions, the moral relation of God and man, and the moral argument for the existence of God. The theoretical part may be subdivided into positive philosophy of religion and theological metaphysics. The former takes into account the empirical sciences, especially the psychology of religion and sociology. Theological metaphysics discusses ontology and epistemology. Ontology has to do with the problems of the being and nature of God, of creation, of the soul, and of immortality; and epistemology concerns itself with the validity of religious

knowledge in relation to agnosticism, naturalism, and scientific knowledge. The problem of epistemology is considered a very important one which calls for serious and hard thinking. Thus Mr. Tennant indicates the comprehensiveness of the field of philosophy of religion, and does not leave much room for other studies, for example theology, whose primary subject-matter is religion. The writer would, no doubt, hold that theology deals with a particular religion, while the philosophy of religion includes all religions, or religion in general.

A. R. Wallace's View of Evolution

The *Outlook*, November 23, contains an article by Mr. W. B. Northrop on Alfred Russell Wallace, who has recently passed away. In the interview which the writer had with the famous scientist, we find an exposition of the latter's view of evolution. It is well known that the theory of natural selection was contemporaneously discovered by Wallace and Charles Darwin; in fact, Wallace had formulated the theory before Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared. While there is a general agreement between the two scientists respecting the origin of species, yet Wallace dissents from Darwin in giving a purely naturalistic explanation for the process of biological evolution. Wallace has expressed his view of evolution in his book on Darwinism. There Wallace introduces spiritual factors to account for the higher forms of organic life, especially man. This spiritual interpretation of evolution is reiterated in the interview of Mr. Northrop with the scientist. "It was on this very point [the existence of spirit]," says Wallace, "that I differed so largely from Darwin. He implied that the nature of man—his mind and his soul (if he had one)—was derived from the lower animals, just as the body was so derived. While Darwin did not deny the action of the Great First Cause—most persons think that Darwin was an atheist, but they do not understand his work—at the same time he believed that man's physical and mental structures developed from the struggle for existence, and that even the intellectual nature proceeded from the lower animals." Wallace's contention is that man's intellectual, moral, and religious capacities cannot be wholly accounted for by the theory of natural selection. "Evolution is true in part," he continues, "but it does not account by any means for all the facts. I am one who believes there is something in man that is infinite and which differs in nature as well as in degree from anything which is seen in the lower animals. I believe that at a certain epoch of our life, when the body is ready to receive it, there is an influx of spirit, and our existence in the future depends very largely on how we adapt ourselves to this new condition when it comes before us." "To call the spiritual nature of man a 'by-product,' developed by us in our struggle for existence, is a joke too big for this little world." "The world has been moved far more by spiritual forces than by material and selfish ones." So Wallace represents a class of men who cannot be satisfied with a wholly naturalistic explanation of organic evolution.

The Modern Quest for Religion

Under this title, Mr. Winston Churchill, author of *The Inside of the Cup*, contributes a significant paper to the December *Century*. He thinks that for the discerning—for those who can truly see and hear—there can be no question that the world is not so skeptical about religious truths as formerly, even as it was ten years ago, or five years ago. That our extraordinary age contains an essential force which transcends figures and mechanics and sense impressions is admitted by many who used to be skeptics, and who now see that their philosophies are not all-sufficient.

Below the surface of history, and behind the physical aspects of the world, is a great

spiritual force which pulses onward like the waves of the sea; and both the crests and the troughs of this wave-like power have meaning and value. There are uses in agnosticism and pessimism through their checking of an extravagant optimism divorced from facts. And who shall say that the evolutionists have not brought us nearer to God?

If we do not believe in democracy, we shall have difficulty finding a place for ourselves in the world which God is creating today. Looking around us, we see that every institution in modern government and modern science has been accomplished against the principle for which the church still stands, the principle of having our thinking done for us. We therefore turn away from the religion which is imposed by external authority, and continue our quest.

The religion which answers the needs of the present democratic age is one that is born in us as we enter the pulsing movement of the world's progress, fighting against evil under the militant leadership of Jesus Christ. In him, the world has something to grow into, instead of something to grow away from. Religion is not a mere deposit of doctrine, but a functional attitude toward life and its problems.

Religious Future of China

Christians and aliens, who constitute only a fraction of 1 per cent of the Chinese population, should not interfere with the settlement of the question whether or not Confucianism is to be the state religion of China. This position is set forth in a lengthy article published in the November *Nineteenth Century* by Mr. R. Fleming Johnson, a district officer in Wei-hai-Wei, China. The writer shows that the proposal to recognize Confucianism in the constitution which is being written for the new republic does not militate against Christian or foreign interests, and that the authors of the proposed measure are not agitating it in opposition to the modernizing of their country by outside influences.

Confucianism has been the state religion of China in the past; and it is imbedded so deeply in the nature and customs of the mass of the people, that to discontinue it would make a violent breach with experience, and cut the republic morally adrift before the full tide of Christianity has begun to flow through the Orient. The Chinamen who advocate the constitutional establishment of Confucianism are as eager for progress and reform as any of the most ardent patriots to be found among the leaders of Young China; and they yield to none in their readiness to borrow from Western lands, and from the storehouse of Western learning and experience, all that may contribute toward the strengthening of the Chinese state and the moral fiber of its people. They recommend a Confucianism which will expand with expanding thought, which will be fully compatible with evolutionary progress, and favorable to the growth of noble ideals in politics, economics, ethics, social life, and religion.

The New Ethical Atmosphere and the Land Problem

The December *Atlantic* publishes the first instalment of a series on the land problem. The communication of Henry George's moral fervor to an ever-widening circle of followers, the progressive embodiment of his ideas in legislation throughout a large part of the civilized world, and the conservation movement in the United States are cited by the writer, Mr. F. W. Garrison, as facts which make pertinent a restatement of the aims and accomplishments of the land reform crusade inaugurated in 1879 by Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*. Mr. Garrison's article is not an original contribution to the subject, but its material is organized in such an effective way as to impress the moral aspects of land reform upon those who have not been hitherto acquainted with the question.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

The Mohammedan Invasion of Africa

It is not only the missionary who is watching with anxiety the spread of Mohammedanism in Africa. "An Anglo-Indian," writing to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, October, 1913, has this to say of the African: "The negro of Africa is not very articulate, and he is therefore relegated to the background in men's minds; but it is only necessary to know a very little about him to recognize that he possesses some remarkable qualities. You may hear an educated negro comment upon the events of the day with a keenness and accuracy of insight, and with a wealth of common sense that are truly astounding. The negro, in a word, is a force worth watching and worth directing into the proper channel." But this direction "is already to an ever-increasing extent in the hands of Islam."

Roman Catholicism in China

The *Chinese Recorder*, October, 1913, contains an article dealing with a very important subject regarding which Protestants in general know next to nothing, namely, "The Work of the Catholic Church in China," written by Joseph De La Serviere, S.J. The church claims today about 1,500,000 believers. Chinese Catholics with few exceptions are very poor. There are almost no converts made from the mandarin classes. But the annual increase in the number of Catholics has for several years past exceeded 50,000. Last year it rose to 84,000, and this year it will reach 100,000. The native clergy even in the most ancient and flourishing missions are very few. This regrettable fact is accounted for by the slow and austere education to which candidates for the priesthood must submit. The clergy can be recruited only in Christian families whose belief has persisted through two or three generations. "They alone have acquired those deep-rooted habits of faith, piety, and moral discipline which lay fast hold upon a child in his tenderest years, and render him competent to hear the call of God." In the matter of lay education, it is confessed that little has been done compared with what has been accomplished by Protestants. The only schools universally established are the "prayer schools" which teach the catechism, the sacred formulae, and some usual Chinese characters, normal schools, and seminaries for the education of the native clergy. Higher education, properly so called, under the direction of the Catholic church is limited to a few institutions.

Awakening Missionary Interest of Unitarians

A Unitarian Missionary Conference was held last month in Boston, in which an effort was made to awaken a sense of denominational responsibility for foreign missions—an audacious undertaking, in view of the fact that it has been the prevailing opinion in Unitarian churches that the foreign missionary enterprise is more or less of an impertinence as well as a waste of effort and money. The attendance upon the Conference was not large, but it received the cordial support of such representative men as ex-President Taft, Dr. Eliot, Edward D. Mead, Professor Christie, Dr. Charles F. Dole, Dr. S. M. Crothers. These names are enough to witness to the importance of the movement, and to assure its continuance. Addresses were made by Professor Kirsopp Lake, of the University of Leiden, Professor Peabody of Harvard, President Faunce of Brown University, Dr. Patton of the Ameri-

can Board. Professor Anesaki of the University of Tokyo, Japan, urged that the real issue in the Far East today was less whether Buddhism or Shintoism or Christianity should be in the ascendent, than whether the new generations should be idealistic or materialistic, individualistic or social-ethical or anarchist. Dr. Dole made an urgent plea to his brethren to forsake their traditional attitude of indifference toward foreign missionary work and do their unique and just part in the world's uplifting.

Mass Movements in India

Whether or not "mass movements" in mission fields should be encouraged, whether in the result they may not injuriously affect churches not yet strong enough or intelligent enough to care for large numbers of converts or adherents suddenly claiming fellowship and instruction, these are debated questions. A contribution of great value to this discussion is made by the *Methodist Review* of November–December, 1913, in an article entitled "Caste Movements (commonly called mass movements) in India and Their Development, as Illustrated in the Work of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Northern India." The discussion proceeds in three divisions: (*a*) The underlying cause of these movements, (*b*) the work necessary for their development, (*c*) the remarkable opportunities presented by the movement and their bearing on the evangelization of India. Under the last head these most significant and encouraging statements are made. The history of older mass movements in India shows that according to the faith of the leaders at the time of acceptance, practically all the people who were received have stood firm, and their descendants have remained Christians; and that there has been a steady rise in the community from generation to generation usually in proportion to the investment of missionary effort along all lines. Hindus and Mohammedans are making efforts to secure these same classes, chiefly for political reasons. The important fact must be remembered that the so-called "out-caste" or "depressed classes" are in reality the laborers of India and potentially the most valuable asset in the land. Increased numbers make self-support more practicable. A united community will more speedily adopt Christian customs and escape from the tyranny of old ties. The movement is likely to encourage the many thousands of heart Christians among the higher classes to come out openly and throw in their lot.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Dangers Involved in Mere Theological Conformity

The *Harvard Theological Review* for October contains a thoughtful article from the pen of Herbert Alden Youtz of Auburn Theological Seminary. He sees danger lurking in the insistent demand for safety devices, whether in railroading or in the realm of personal religious faith. A false sense of security arising from reliance upon external appliances of any character is likely to smother certain personal capacities and creative moral insights and sympathies without which no character is complete. Every really creative soul must be venturesome and live on a philosophy of life's inevitable risks; to rely upon an infallible authority for guidance in any sphere of life is as fatal as to depend wholly upon automatic safety devices which are in the last analysis always in the hands of men who control them. Theories of infallibility or of infallible guidance of any sort defeat the real ends of personality. The underlying philosophy of every "safe" theology involves subscription to various orthodoxies in order

to bring a sense of peace and security which in its very snugness is fatal. Reliance upon "direct and fundamental proofs for the existence of God" rather than upon the soul's living contact with spiritual reality means the defeat of the spiritual achievements of the race. Highest spiritual discernment is creative, not imitative. A standardized theology cannot be the criterion of judgment in the great missionary enterprise among alien races; there must rather be a reaction of each race upon the fundamental truths of religion, and a natural and spontaneous response to those truths in terms of the experience of each race or group. We cannot demand conformity to ready-made orthodoxies. Likewise, in the growth of the social needs of our day, we are not to refer back to an orthodoxy that has ceased to meet the demands of our new age; we must find in the life of today the vision of God and the spiritual meaning of Christ. Slavish conformity to past orthodoxies is nothing less than reliance upon automatic safety devices; it is the substitution of a mechanical for a spiritual theology. Theological safety devices are sought only when men come to distrust the reality and the possibility of present guidance. The only orthodoxy that is really safe is reliance upon the Holy Spirit eternally at work in the world.

The "Biblical World" Bible-Study Course

It is interesting to note how enthusiastically the outline course on the Origin and Teaching of the New Testament Books, which has been running in the *Biblical World* ever since September, is being received. In the city of Denver three hundred Sunday-school teachers are studying the course under the leadership of three representatives of the Iliff School of Theology and the auspices of the Denver Teacher Training Institute.

In St. Louis, Mo., under the able leadership of Dr. W. C. Bitting, of the Second Baptist Church, three hundred women are devoting one morning a week to its study. Hundreds of individuals and smaller groups are enjoying the course and finding in it a sound basis for all future study of the New Testament. How many readers of the *Biblical World* are there who have not investigated this course, the fifth section of which appears in this number?

The Religious Education Club of the University of Chicago

The Religious Education Club of the University of Chicago has for its winter's program the consideration of what should be taught the present generation of Sunday-school children on the practical questions of church federation and church union. Educational leaders in the various denominations will present papers, not on the general issues of church union, but specifically on what each denomination can and should teach. In conclusion three papers will be presented on the bearing of such teaching upon the progress of the Kingdom in the Orient, in our American cities, and in our rural districts.

This is one of the vital questions which will soon become acute among those who are interested in progressive plans for religious education.

The Psychology of Oriental Religious Experience

An interesting contribution to the question of education in the Orient has just been made by Mr. Katsuji Kato, who has recently presented as his Doctor's thesis a discussion of the psychology of the oriental religious experience. The trend of this thesis is to establish the theory that religious experience is largely governed by environment and that there is no intrinsic

difference between oriental and occidental religious experience. The closing chapter will be particularly interesting to those who are engaged in mission work, as it strikes at fundamental weaknesses in missionary methods of the past. The thesis is as yet unpublished, but will be accessible before long.

CHURCH EFFICIENCY

Is the Sermon on the Mount a Goal for Laymen?

Sir Francis Younghusband discusses the religious problem of the enlightened laity in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, 1913. He points out very clearly and sympathetically their needs and urges that the men of serious mind meet these needs. The laymen of today are very desirous of knowing the nature of the Principle or Person which governs the universe and of the goal toward which their conduct should be directed. They naturally turn to the Bible to get answer for their first quest. But even the conception of God as Father taught by Jesus seems to many too remote to satisfy their need. But of one thing they are certain: they feel that they are under an impelling influence to strive for the best even though they may ultimately fail. "There is that striving within men which, even with this drear possibility before them, drives them on to reach forward to the best" (p. 23).

Now, what is the nature of this ideal toward which men should strive? This is a perplexing problem. It is usually held that at least in the Sermon on the Mount the moral ideal can be discovered which should be the goal of human conduct. But men refuse to follow a moral ideal which promises to them the kind of heaven as depicted in the parable of the poor man Lazarus where it will be impossible to relieve the suffering. They consider it a wrongful attitude to expect goods supplied to them without conscious efforts on their part. Even the so-called "Golden Rule" needs widening and heightening. For numbers and numbers of persons have transcended the injunctions of the "Golden Rule." In short, the moral ideals contained in the Sermon on the Mount are inadequate to satisfy the ethical needs of the modern laity. This uncertainty as to the nature of God and of the goal of moral conduct calls for serious thought on the part of those who are interested in the higher values of humanity. The laity do not look to those who adhere to the Bible as their ultimate moral and religious authority. They seek "that poets, preachers, philosophers, men of art, will infuse mankind with an ever-glowing religion, redden the life-blood in our veins, clear our visions, and set our passionate impulses glowing with new and sacred radiance. They trust that the most acute and earnest philosophers will vigorously chart out the course which we should navigate; that the most inspired poets will weave for us ideals by which to steer our way; and that preachers, with burning spiritual fervor, hot from the central furnace of the world, will instil into us a forcefulness which will carry us unfaltering to our goal" (p. 34).

A Warning as to Social Service

In the October *Harvard Theological Review*, Dr. C. W. Eliot, formerly president of Harvard University, discusses "The Churches and the Prevailing Social Sentiment." The prevailing social sentiment was developed during the last half of the nineteenth century. In the development of this new sentiment, the churches as such had no direct share. It was due to the men and women who had a slight or no connection with the churches. The majority of the churches as yet have not adjusted

themselves to the social sentiment. Nevertheless it has found expression in various societies, clubs, and associations, such as the Young Men's and Women's Christian Associations, for social reform and development.

In the beginning of the twentieth century the churches began to take cognizance of the new interest. They saw in it a field of new activity for them. They began to ally themselves with the organizations for social betterment. In the recent years the evangelical churches have shown a disposition for united efforts in this direction. This is illustrated in the principles advocated by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Dangers, however, are evident in this new enterprise of the churches. They are likely to lose sight of the fact that social service requires a great deal of knowledge in reference especially to economics and sociology. They mean well when they declare for "proper" regulation for marriages, for child labor, for wage, and the like, but they often fail to define what *is proper* regulation for marriages and so forth. Consequently the churches must exercise much foresight and wisdom in their activities for social welfare.

The young people whom they direct for this work should be trained for social service either in the schools or by being employed as apprentices under experts in this field. The ministers, too, who must lead this new activity should devote hours of their study to subjects which are adapted to prepare them for social service, such as economics, government, and inductive methods of finding facts. Thus, according to Dr. Eliot, the churches can avoid dangers and will be enabled to have a large share in the activities for social amelioration.

Reorganizing Congregationalism

The recent sessions of the National Council of Congregational churches in the United States marked a significant change in the organization and corporate life of this denomination with its membership of something over three-quarters of a million. The growing demand for efficiency has long laid heavy strain upon the principle of complete autonomy for the local church, and, as in the case of the Baptists some half-dozen years ago, called for some sort of reorganization to check the waste of energy which invariably comes with too little centralization of control. Accordingly, after considerable animated discussion on the report of the Committee of Nineteen, steps were taken which bring the seven strong missionary and benevolent societies of the Congregationalists under the "supervisory and correlating oversight of the churches through the National Council." Professor Graham Taylor of Chicago, in a recent number of the *Survey*, characterizes this action in the words: "It would have been difficult to imagine the possibility of such a readjustment had these delegates and their churches been more mechanically bound together by authority—credal, ceremonial, or governmental. But faith in their fellowship, social unity in service, stood out as the common denominators of all these complex phenomena of divergent forces. The orthodoxy of the spirit was the supreme test, the loyalty of love was regnant."

The adoption of a creed was another measure which has called forth much surprise and interest. In less than two hundred words, over half of which are devoted to bringing home to the heart, conscience, and will the real mission of the church, this body drew up a statement which has been deemed by the press of the country "nobly broad and faithfully narrow." The end of the church's existence is set forth to be "to labor for the progress of knowledge, the promotion of justice, the triumph of peace, and the realization of human brotherhood."

Another important step taken by the

National Council in this session was the establishment of a social service commission of nine members "to promote the welfare of the country life and church, to deal with city problems and progress, and to improve industrial conditions and relations." Closer co-operation with the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is also sought in this realignment of the forces of Congregationalism.

The Chinese Christian Church of Nanking

An interesting experiment in church organization and union has recently been attempted by the Chinese Christians of Nanking. From among the four hundred and more students who signed cards indicating their personal interest in Christianity at the time of the recent Mott and Eddy meetings in that city, there continued to be some hundred and sixty who, after careful study of the question, had decided to stand out for the Christian religion. It was found on examination that most of this number, however, were not affiliating with the churches of the city owing to "foreign domination" in the various congregations. In order to meet this need and to secure the membership of not a few others who, for the same reason, were professing Christ without joining the church, the Nanking Evangelistic Association met in special session, with foreign advisers present, and formed what is to be known as the Chinese Christian Church of Nanking, without denominational affiliation and to be administered wholly by native leadership. Several interesting features are to be noted in this new organization: the form of baptism is to be optional with the candidate; open communion prevails; the pastor is hired for a term of three years with the church's privilege of renewal at the end of that time; membership is conditioned upon a probation period of three months, an associate membership of six months further, with special instruction, examination for admission by the pastor after this course of training, baptism, and systematic support of the church's benevolences in regular giving.

As the result of this new project the matter of church affiliation has become a burning question, and a special committee from among the missionary force of Nanking has been appointed to consider carefully the question of uniting all the Protestant churches of that city into one body and to make recommendations for the same to the various missionary bodies at work in that city.

The short but comprehensive creed adopted by this new, undenominational native church is as follows:

(1) We recognize the one and only God as Lord over all creation and as Father of all men.

(2) We recognize Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God who came into the world and became man that he might be the Savior of all men (literally, "ten thousand men").

(3) We recognize the Holy Spirit as the third person in the Trinity, our Regenerator and Sanctifier.

(4) We recognize the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God and our rule of faith and practice.

This is admittedly an experiment, but an outgrowth of the healthy desire of the native church in China to bear its own responsibilities and shape its own future. The project has the hearty support of the missionary constituency and has been eagerly entered upon by the Chinese Christians.

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

UNCANONICAL WRITINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT[1]

J. M. POWIS SMITH
Associate Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, University of Chicago

The apocryphal books are those which did not gain admission into the Hebrew Bible, but were incorporated in the Greek and Latin Bibles and were treated by the Roman Catholic church, and in part by the Greek church, as canonical. The distinction between canonical and apocryphal books is clear and definite; but that between apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings is not so sharply defined. In general, the latter term applies to writings which were published as the work of others than the real authors. The latter sought to obtain for their productions the consideration and authority that attached to famous names of the past, and therefore attributed their own writings to such men as Enoch, Solomon, and Isaiah, if they were writing primarily for Jews, and to such authors as Aristeas and the Sibylls, if for non-Jews. Dr. Charles's splendid volumes contain (1) the Apocrypha proper, plus the Third Book of Maccabees which really belongs with them; (2) "all the remaining extant non-canonical Jewish books written between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100 with possibly one or two exceptions"; and (3) the Story of Ahikar and Pirkē Aboth (i.e., Sayings of the Fathers).

The value of this literature is twofold. In the first place, it presents much which in itself is of importance for instruction and edification. Not a few of these writings suffer in no respect by comparison with some of the canonical books of the Old Testament. It is open to no doubt that such sentiments as fill the books of Ecclesiasticus and the Wisdom of Solomon, for example, are of nobler type than those represented by the Book of Esther and the Song of Songs. The Protestant church has lost much in various ways by its indiscriminate condemnation of the uncanonical literature *in toto*. In the second place, this literature is of great historical significance. Take the Story of Ahikar, for example. This story originated at least as far back as 500 B.C. Its scene is laid in the days of Sennacherib; it was current in an Aramaic version among the Jews of Egypt in the fifth century B.C.; and it is known also in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Greek, and Slavonic versions. It belongs to the class of world-literature and carries the evidence of such international reading back to a very early date. It puts the question of the interchange of religious and ethical ideas between the Hebrews and their contemporaries in a new light. The Books of the Maccabees are invaluable for the information they yield concerning the history of the Maccabean and following periods. These books are all of especial interest and importance by reason of the fact that they constitute our sources of information regarding the life and thought of the New Testament period. As Dr. Charles says, "without them it is absolutely impossible to explain the course of religious development between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100." These are all "books which influenced our Lord and his apostles." We learn from these what

[1] *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books.* Edited, in conjunction with many scholars, by R. H. Charles. New York: Oxford University Press, 1913. 2 vols. 4to, pp. xii+684 and xiv+871. $19.25.

expectations and hopes were cherished by the Jews of that age, what ideals of life inspired them, and what discouragements beset them. We find here much that entered into the teachings of the early Christian church.

The general editor of this work was the man of all men to undertake this task. Dr. Charles has devoted the scholarly energy of his life to the study and interpretation of this kind of literature. He knows the field as few, if any other, scholars do. He had already published editions of the text of Jubilees, Martyrdom of Isaiah, Testament of the XII Patriarchs, Assumption of Moses, II Baruch, and Enoch. All of these he himself handles in the volumes before us. He also translates and annotates the Fragments of a Zadokite Work, which is here for the first time included in a general collection of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. For this brand new contribution from his pen we are duly grateful. No scholar can regard with indifference the conclusions of Dr. Charles about this much-discussed document.

For the preparation of the translations and notes upon the remaining books, Dr. Charles has secured the co-operation of a group of distinguished scholars. We can but list them here: H. T. Andrews, The Letter of Aristeas; C. J. Ball, The Epistle of Jeremy; W. H. Bennett, The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children; G. H. Box, IV Ezra and Ecclesiasticus (with W. O. E. Oesterley); F. C. Conybeare, The Story of Ahikar (Armenian); S. A. Cook, Esdras; A. E. Cowley, Judith; T. Witton Davies, Bel and the Dragon; Cyril W. Emmett, III Maccabees; Nevill Forbes, II Enoch (translation); G. Buchanan Gray, The Psalms of Solomon; J. A. F. Gregg, The Additions to Esther; J. Rendel Harris, The Story of Ahikar (Syriac, Aramaic, and Greek versions); R. Travers Herford, The Sayings of the Fathers; Samuel Holmes, The Wisdom of Solomon; H. Maldwyn Hughes, III Baruch; D. M. Kay, Susanna; H. C. O. Lanchester, The Sibylline Oracles; Agnes Smith Lewis, The Story of Ahikar (Arabic version); James Moffatt, II Maccabees; W. O. E. Oesterley, I Maccabees and Ecclesiasticus (with G. H. Box); H. E. Ryle, The Prayer of Manasses; D. C. Simpson, Tobit; R. B. Townshend, IV Maccabees; L. S. A. Wells, The Books of Adam and Eve; and O. C. Whitehouse, I Baruch.

The general plan, formulated by Dr. Charles and followed more or less closely by all of the contributors, arranges for a translation of each book, with critical and exegetical annotations, and an introduction. The introductions treat (1) a summary of each book and its general significance, (2) the title, (3) the MSS, (4) the ancient versions, (5) date of the original text and of the various versions, (6) the integrity or composite character of the book, (7) authorship, (8) influence of the book upon Jewish and Christian literature, (9) theology of the book, and (10) bibliography. The translation is in each case the interpreter's own, with the exception of a few cases where the Revised Version has been adopted, viz., I Esdras (where the parallel passages from the canonical Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles are printed in columns alongside the Esdras text), Judith, Baruch, Epistle of Jeremy, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon (in both of which a translation of the Septuagint is printed alongside the Revised Version made from Theodotion). The rendering of Ecclesiasticus, by Box and Oesterley, is a valuable contribution, because it rests upon a critical text reconstructed upon the basis of the fragments of the original Hebrew thus far found. The translation of Tobit, likewise, is new, being based upon the Sinaitic text and accompanied by a full critical apparatus. All of the work is of high order, though naturally not of equal value. The contributors to the result are men who have in most cases won

their spurs by previous publications in this field. The general oversight of the editor is, of itself, a sufficient guaranty of the high quality of the work as a whole and in detail.

These two volumes constitute by all odds the best edition of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha now extant. There has been heretofore nothing approximating their merit in English. In German Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* is less comprehensive and thorough and furthermore is at present, in some particulars, far behind the advance of knowledge in this field of learning. Dr. Charles's work is a book for scholars, because of the fact that it represents the high-water mark of attainment, gathering up into itself all that has thus far been wrought out upon these writings and in many cases marking a long step in advance. There is also much in the volumes that will appeal only to scholars and experts. The critical apparatus, in some cases abounding in Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Greek type, will frighten the unskilled reader, but will be highly appreciated by the trained scholar. Yet there is much in these volumes for the non-technical student. The translations themselves, most of the introductory statements to the several books, and the great bulk of the exegetical notes are of a character to prove of great value to the plain man.

The cost of the volumes is, however, practically prohibitive for most would-be purchasers. The consequence is that the work will find entry for the most part only into the libraries of seminaries and universities and of the few well-to-do people who have a special interest in this sort of thing. It is much to be desired that the publishers may see their way clear to the issuance of a small and cheap edition, containing only the translations and the more general matter in the introductions and notes. Only thus can the splendid works here brought together meet with the wide appreciation they so well deserve and accomplish that awakening of general interest in the uncanonical literature which they are so well calculated to produce. Meantime, we rejoice that British scholarship has been able to make this great contribution to a better understanding of these too-little-known writings.

BOOK NOTICES

The Beginnings of Quakerism. By William C. Braithwaite. London: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. xliv+562. $3.50.

Christian people know too little about the origin and significance of the Quakers, or Friends. A religious tradition which could shape Whittier the poet, in America, and Bright the democratic statesman and peer of Gladstone, in England, is worthy of the most respectful attention. This book will help to spread information which ought to have a place in the culture of all educated persons. It shows the relation of Quakerism to the Protestant churches and to the social conditions of the seventeenth century. The author truly says that while religious movements develop with the help of a favoring environment, they spring, nevertheless, out of great personal experiences. Truth roots itself in the lives of individuals before it can be uttered in the form of a message. A religious movement, then, is not an abstract influence without a local habitation. It finds expression in terms of personality, and cannot be rightly apprehended unless it be taken up from this point of view.

In the case of Quakerism, the outstanding personality is, of course, George Fox, who therefore occupies the center of the stage in this excellent volume. Fox had his first awakening in his nineteenth year, not over his own sins, but over the moral conditions and social customs around him. The leading religious parties at that time, in England as well as elsewhere, were trying to control the machinery of state. One of the ruling ideas in religion was consequently that of *solidarity:* i.e., nations ought to be organized by law on behalf of some definite form of doctrine and worship. This principle was held not only by Catholics, who were the original exponents of the union of Church and State in Christendom, but by Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists. Against the principle of solidarity in religion, George Fox

and the Quakers reacted vigorously in favor of individualism as the standard of spiritual life. Along with other sectaries, such as the Baptists, these humble folk became the modern protagonists of toleration and the "inner light." Fox magnificently represented that type of religion which is known as mysticism, in which all the deep-lying powers of human life come into an experience of harmony and immediate relationship to the living God. In Quakerism at its best, the Christian maintains a sane and normal hold upon commonplace duties and realities, yet finds within himself the fresh and bubbling streams that flow directly from the Eternal Fountain, so that he can say in quiet assurance, with Whittier,

"I know not where His islands lift their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift beyond His love and care."

The present volume is a thorough, scholarly study of the beginnings of Quakerism; and it is an admirable contribution to church history in the broad sense. The introduction is by Professor R. M. Jones, of Haverford College; and the text incorporates a large amount of judiciously selected source material.

The Religious Instinct. By Thomas J. Hardy. London: Longmans, 1913. Pp. 300. $1.60.

A type of contemporary Anglican thought is well represented by this book. The author is a clergyman of good classical education and first-rate literary talent, who feels upon himself the burden of adjusting modern spiritual conditions to the perplexing circumstances of the times. He remarks that the cry of the hour, which arises on all sides, is for a new religion; but he declares that what is needed is a new venture in the old faith of the centuries. We agree in principle with his entire contention. Yet we believe that present-day Christianity is rapidly advancing toward a type of reaction different from that for which the author stands. "It is not the people's fault that there is so much unfaith," he writes. "The fault is entirely that of their teachers" (p. 270). "Today the Pharisee and the Sadducee, in the shape of the Ethicist and the Modernist, are detrimental to the interests of all that Christ had at heart. Unless their influence is countermined by a fresh and vigorous response to Christ, we, like the Jews of old, must pay the penalty" (p. 274).

The author belongs thus to the school which interprets our spiritual difficulties in the light of pure individualism, and finds the solutions of our problems in the same terms. Accordingly he misses a large part of the significance of the ancient Pharisees and Sadducees, which was as much social as merely philosophical. Their attitude went along with their championship of aristocracy and special privilege in opposition to the implicit democracy of Christ. While we hold no briefs for the "ethicist" and the "modernist," we suspect that much of the popular indifference which pains our author is due to an instinctive perception that the church at large has to a degree failed to reproduce the spiritual emphasis of Christ in its true social setting. In other words, we think that our high Anglican friends over the sea have something to learn from the movement now sweeping through the ranks of the Nonconformists of Britain. Dr. Hardy's book is a good example of Christian scholarship, and is worthy of careful study by anyone who desires to become more closely acquainted with the school for which he stands.

The Religious Development of the Child. By Rufus M. Weaver. New York: Revell, 1913. Pp. 274. $1.25.

The author is pastor of the Emmanuel Baptist Church, Nashville, Tennessee. He describes the book as "an evangelical study from the scientific viewpoint." The introductory pages are by Professor John R. Sampey, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky. A product of careful study and large practical experience, the volume deserves a wide circulation among educators and pastors who are actively concerned with the readjustment of the church to modern conditions. The book is not an epoch-maker; it seeks to interpret an epoch to minds which are perplexed by some of the tendencies of our age. Instead of beginning with a topic having immediate and obvious bearing upon the main subject, the author wisely undertakes to view the psychology of childhood in a broad perspective. He sets out with a study of religious conditions of today, bringing his discussion down through narrowing circles to the central theme, and stressing the claim that the church must put a more intelligent emphasis upon the religious experiences of the child. Chapter titles: "The Modern World and the Religion for the Child," "The Churches and the Child," "The Psychology of the Child," "The Science of Conversion," "The Religion of the Child," "The Institution and the Child," "The Teachers of the Child," "The Religious Nature of the Child."

Schleiermacher: A Critical and Historical Study. By W. B. Selbie. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1913. Pp. ix+267. $2.25.

One of the important aids to the appreciation of today's theology is the study of Schleiermacher and his work. The life of this great scholar covered a period which was one of the

psychological moments in the history of human thought, namely, the close of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth. It was a martial time; and the spirit of the French Revolution was at work in the studies and classrooms of Germany. Christianity was facing new social and scientific movements; and the need for a fresh interpretation of the gospel was imperative. Schleiermacher has not been so well understood in Great Britain and America as he ought to be; but English works on him are now appearing. He represents the beginnings of the new method and the new spirit in the modern reconstruction of religious thinking, and may be fitly described as the father of modern scientific theology. He insisted on the historical character of the Christian faith, as contrasted with its merely dogmatic, or doctrinal, formulation. It is to Schleiermacher that we owe perhaps the earliest impulse toward emphasis upon religion as a vital experience rather than as mere cold belief. He is the forerunner of those who have put stress upon the subjective aspect of the atonement. As Ritschl has well said, he shows that, through Jesus, "redemption has become operative as a principle for the molding of the devout self-consciousness, which does not take its shape from a legally enjoined doctrine and constitution." The book before us is by an Oxford professor; and it will find a place alongside the recent treatises by Cross and Munro.

The Life of Frances E. Willard. By Anna Adams Gordon. Evanston, Ill.: National W.C.T.U., 1912. Pp. xiv+357. $2.00.

This is an abridgment and revision from a Willard memorial volume issued in 1898. The reasons for the appearance of the present work are found in the transient character of much of the material contained in the earlier volume, the demand for a book with wider perspective, and the fact that there is within the reach of the public no complete record of one of America's most noble women. Published by an organization of which Miss Willard was president, and written by one who shared her intimate life for more than twenty years, this narrative is in a sense her official biography. It has value not only as the history of a leader in a great moral movement with wide ramifications; it is also valuable as a record of the life of a typical American citizen who was ahead of her times, and yet tactful enough to be a leader of her times. Preceded by an introduction from the pen of Lady Henry Somerset, the story begins with the ancestry and childhood of Miss Willard, rounding out the earlier period with glimpses of her student life and religious development. The narrative then takes up her career as teacher, traveler, organizer, founder, and leader. The book is well written, and ought to be widely placed in public and private libraries.

Anthony Comstock, Fighter. By Charles G. Trumbull. New York: Revell, 1913. Pp. 240. $1.25.

The secondary title, "Some Impressions of a Lifetime of Adventure in Conflict with the Powers of Evil," prepares one for a bird's-eye view of Mr. Comstock's remarkable career. Everybody knows something about the hero of this book; and there are few who will not profit by a careful reading of Mr. Trumbull's interestingly written story. Its chief value lies in its revelations of moral history in America during the last forty years. It is a "source" of first-class rank and first-hand value, which future historians will use and appreciate. Not only so; but wholly aside from its moral and scientific value, the book is worth while merely as a pastime. If you like to read about Sherlock Holmes and his imaginary adventures in the world of crime, you will not fail to be absorbed in this narrative about a *real* man, a Christian hero fighting against the rule of the kingdom of darkness.

The Christian Reconstruction of Modern Life. By C. H. Dickinson. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. ix+327. $1.50.

The object of this volume is the spiritualizing of the social passion. The author's conviction is that this mightiest force of our age cannot attain its reconstructive purpose except as it is conscious of its own implicit spirituality. Many new books written from this point of view are now appearing; so that a single volume, such as this, loses part of the force which it might have had five or ten years ago. Mr. Dickinson's book is a creditable and scholarly essay on the present social awakening as judged from the standpoint of liberal Christianity. One may question whether the book will reach many of the "illiterate men and women" whom the author figures as entreating, "Write the spiritualizing of the social gospel in words not too hard for us"; but the volume will be a help and an inspiration to thoughtful men and women who are not so far along as the author on the modern reconstructed highway.

Codex Rehdigeranus: Die vier Evangelien nach der lateinischen Handschrift R 169 der Stadtbibliothek Breslau. ("Collectanea Biblica Latina," Vol. II.) Von H. J. Vogels. Mit drei Tafeln. Rome: Pustet, 1913. Pp. xlvi+300. $2.50.

The elaborate preparations being made for a critical revision of the Latin Vulgate are freshly illustrated by this attractive volume. The Rehdiger manuscript of the Four Gospels was written about 700 A.D. In 1569 it passed

into the hands of Thomas Rehdiger with whose collection it finally passed into the city library of Breslau. In text the manuscript allies itself with the Irish branch of Vulgate manuscripts, but it exhibits no small affinity with the Old Latin and seems to represent a transitional or at least a mixed text. Haase's painstaking edition of the manuscript is now so rare and inaccessible and its actual imperfections were such, especially where corrections were concerned, that Vogels has provided this admirable edition, in which particular account is taken of erasures and corrections of all sorts. The result is an ideally complete and convenient edition of the text, column by column and line by line. The three facsimiles from different parts of the codex will give an idea of its general style and be of use to the palaeographer.

The Signification of b^{e}rākā—A Semasiological Study of the Semitic Stem b–r–k. By T. Plassmann. New York: J. F. Wagner, 1913. Pp. xii+180.

This is a most elaborately worked-out study in the semasiology of the word "bless" in Hebrew. Semasiology is a relatively new branch of Semitic lexicography; it may be defined as the science of the meaning of words. This study takes into consideration the entire history and usage of the word *b–r–k* throughout the Semitic group of languages. It reveals a complete mastery of the methodology of this field, a working familiarity with the dictionaries of the entire group of languages, and the power of keen discrimination among meanings and origins. At times the processes and conclusions are somewhat subjective, but the main results are well sustained. The study furnishes an excellent model for other workers. It was prepared as a thesis for the degree of Ph.D. to the faculty of the Catholic University of America at Washington, D.C. It reflects great credit upon the institution as well as the author.

A manual for Bible students appears under the title *Classbook of Old Testament History* (Macmillan, $1.00). The author is Dr. George Hodges, dean of the Episcopal Theological School, in Cambridge, Mass. It is intended for the general reader and for classes in schools and churches. The author says that he has made constant use of recent discoveries, and of the "conservative" results of scholarship (p. v). While the book indicates that the writer is acquainted with most of the leading conclusions of modern critical study of the Old Testament, the treatise itself is hardly fitted to convey those conclusions to students and general readers. Its lights and shadows are accommodated to those who may come to the book with the older presuppositions in mind. The real problems of Old Testament history and religion, as now under discussion by the leading scholars, are not recognized. The writings of such men as H. P. Smith, Driver, G. F. Moore, and G. A. Smith are mentioned only in the preface. A present-day textbook on Old Testament history for students and general readers should have an ample equipment of detailed references to the works of such men. It is of course, a matter of difficulty for one who is writing a popular treatise of this kind to decide just what to include and what to omit.

A useful study of the period lying between the Old and New Testaments appears in *Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod*, by Dr. B. H. Alford (Longmans, Green & Co., $1.00). The book is issued as a continuation of the author's earlier work on Old Testament history and literature. The present volume surveys in some detail what the Jews wrote in the interval between the passing of Simon the Hasmonean and the coming of John the Baptist. The author hopes to make more clear the connection between the different parts of Scripture. The book is a useful study of the intermediate period.

Under the title *The New Testament Period and Its Leaders* (Sherman, French & Co., $1.35), Rev. Frank T. Lee, D.D., undertakes to show "how Christianity was prepared for, inaugurated, emancipated from Judaism, and became universal." The author is a devout Christian, who writes with the best of intentions, and who is unaware of the problems now uppermost among scholars who are investigating the rise of Christianity from the scientific point of view.

Two further collections of devotional material are before us compiled from manuscripts left by the late Dr. J. R. Miller (Crowell, $1.00 each). One is entitled *The Glory of the Commonplace*. It is well adapted to stimulate its readers to holier and truer lives. Dr. Miller had the faculty of saying unusual things about ordinary affairs. The other volume is called *Things That Endure*. "There is no immortality for vanity and self-seeking," writes Dr. Miller. "Nothing that we do for ourselves will endure. Our work will last only when it is inspired by love and is wrought in the name of Christ."

Still another book on modern Chinese conditions appears, under the title *New Thrills in Old China* (Doran, $1.00), by Charlotte E. Hawes, a Presbyterian missionary at Shantung. Her experience in China began in 1897; and she has lived through the Boxer riots and the subsequent period of unrest leading up to the revolution which destroyed the Manchu dynasty. She writes entertainingly of these events.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. V

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

This course is published in ten leaflets issued on the fifteenth of each month from September, 1913, to June, 1914. It is sent free to all members of the AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE *enrolling for this course. Membership in the* INSTITUTE *may be secured by sending the annual membership fee of fifty cents and four cents for postage to the headquarters of the* INSTITUTE, *at the University of Chicago.*

STUDY V

CHAPTER IX

THE FIRST MEMOIRS CONCERNING JESUS' PUBLIC CAREER AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Thus far in our study we have been dealing with one of the simplest forms of literature—letters. We have noticed how naturally and directly these letters sprang out of the actual needs of the church and Paul's relation to them. But other forms of literature are also the product of experience, and arise to meet human needs. In the same decades in which Paul was preaching the gospel and writing his letters, in part just because of the success of his work, there came to be felt, most naturally, a need for a record of the life and words of that Jesus whom Paul proclaimed to be the Son of God. The first response to the need, of which we have any definite trace, was a collection of the sayings of Jesus probably made by the publican-apostle Matthew and first put forth in the later years of the apostle Paul. It may be thought of as the first edition of our Gospel of Matthew, but no copies of it are now in existence. Upon this there followed, probably not many years later, a book chiefly devoted to the deeds of Jesus, but including also some of his teachings—the Gospel of Mark. Still later came our Gospel of Matthew (probably so called because it took up into itself the collection of sayings gathered

by the apostle Matthew), and the Gospel of Luke; and finally, near the end of the century, the Gospel of John.

There are three ways of reading these books. Because they deal with the life of Jesus, we may use them to gain a knowledge of what he said and did. Or, remembering that they were written to meet existing religious needs of the time in which they were written, we may try to read them as they were read by those for whom they were first written. Or, still again, we may forget alike when they were written, or when the events which they record took place, and ask simply what message they bring to us today. In the first case we are carried back to the years between 25 and 30 A.D.; in the second case to the years between about 60 and 100 A.D.; in the third case we remain in the twentieth century.

All of these ways of reading the books are legitimate. The second is the most difficult, but because it is truest to the actual origin of the books, it is in the end most fruitful, provided only we may make it a stepping-stone to the results at which both the other methods aim. Through it we gain eventually both the most accurate knowledge of the life of Jesus and the greatest help for our own lives. Those who can do so are advised to try in the present study to read the books from this point of view. But we must not read into the books more of adaptation to current needs than is really there. This applies especially to the Second Gospel. For it seems probable that Mark wrote chiefly under the influence of the feeling that his fellow-Christians needed for their own spiritual development to have a connected account of what Jesus did and taught, and that only here and there has he in mind particular beliefs that he wishes to strengthen or errors that he wishes to correct.

First day.—§ 34. *The writer of our oldest extant Gospel—the Gospel of Mark.* Strong Christian tradition testifies that the writer of our Second Gospel was the John Mark who is mentioned in Acts 12:12, 25; 13:5, 13; 15:37, 39; Col. 4:10, 11; Philemon 24; I Pet. 5:13; II Tim. 4:11. Prefixing to these passages Mark 14:51, 52 with its probable evidence that the author of this gospel was a young man in Jerusalem when Jesus was crucified, construct from the passages a sketch of the life of Mark, and form as vivid an impression as you can of the kind of man he was, and his connection with the early Christian movement.

Second day.—Look over the following analysis of the Gospel of Mark, noticing that, so far as this analysis shows at least, the writer's adaptation of his material to the needs of his readers has not greatly affected the plan of his book, but that he has arranged it according to the periods of the life of Jesus. Fix these main periods in mind. The evidences of adjustment to needs will appear in the content of the sections, rather than in their arrangement.

ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK

I. Introduction:
Preparation for the public work of Jesus (1:1–13).
1. Preaching of John the Baptist (1:1–8).
2. Baptism of Jesus (1:9–11).
3. Temptation in the wilderness (1:12, 13).

II. The Galilean Ministry (1:14—9:50).
1. The work begun and favorably received (1:14–45).
a) Jesus begins preaching in Galilee (1:14, 15).
b) Call of the four fishermen (1:16–20).
c) A Sabbath in Capernaum (1:21–34).
d) A preaching tour in Galilee (1:35–45).
2. The opposition of the scribes and Pharisees excited and rapidly developed (2:1—3:6).
a) A paralytic healed and his sins forgiven (2:1–12).
b) Call of Levi, and the feast in his house (2:13–17).
c) Jesus' answer to a question concerning fasting (2:18–22).
d) Plucking grain on the Sabbath (2:23–28).
e) A withered hand healed on the Sabbath (3:1–6).
3. The beginnings of the separation between the followers of Christ and the rest of the community; the organization of the band of twelve personal attendants and helpers (3:7–35).
a) The widespread fame of Jesus (3:7–12).
b) The choosing of the Twelve (3:13–19).
c) Concerning eternal sin (3:20–30).
d) Natural and spiritual kinsmen (3:31–35).
4. The parables of the kingdom's growth, in which is also illustrated its separating power (4:1–34).
5. Sundry manifestations of his power, which meet with varied reception, some believing, some unbelieving, some slow to believe (4:35—6:6).
a) Stilling of the tempest (4:35–41).
b) The Gerasene demoniac (5:1–20).
c) Jairus' daughter raised to life (5:21–43).
d) The rejection at Nazareth (6:1–6).
6. The sending out of the Twelve to engage in work like his own (6:7–29).
7. The continuance of his work in Galilee, with the reappearance of the same features: he heals and feeds the multitudes; his disciples are slow of understanding; the multitudes follow him; the Pharisees oppose him (6:30—7:23).
a) The feeding of the five thousand (6:30–46).
b) Jesus walking on the sea (6:47–52).

c) Many healed in Galilee (6:53–56).
d) On eating with unwashen hands (7:1–23).

8. A withdrawal from Galilee into gentile territory, and the ready faith which Jesus finds there (7:24–37).
   a) The Syrophoenician woman's daughter (7:24–30).
   b) The deaf and dumb man healed (7:31–37).
9. Further experiences in Galilee in which the same features as before appear (8:1–26).
   a) The feeding of the four thousand (8:1–10).
   b) Pharisees demanding a sign from heaven (8:11–21).
   c) A blind man healed near Bethsaida (8:22–26).
10. A second withdrawal from Galilee: tour to Caesarea Philippi and return to the sea. He draws out from Peter the confession of him as the Christ, and begins to teach his disciples concerning his own sufferings, and the conditions of discipleship to him (8:27—9:50).
   a) Peter's confession of Jesus' messiahship (8:27–30).
   b) Jesus' prediction of his own death and resurrection (8:31—9:1).
   c) The transfiguration (9:2–13).
   d) The demoniac boy healed (9:14–29).
   e) Jesus again foretells his death and resurrection (9:30–32).
   f) The ambition and jealousy of the disciples reproved (9:33–50).

III. The Journey from Galilee to Judea, and instructions on the way; on nearing Jerusalem he is publicly saluted as Son of David (chap. 10).
1. Departure from Galilee into Perea (10:1).
2. Concerning divorce (10:2–12).
3. Blessing little children (10:13–16).
4. The rich young ruler (10:17–31).
5. Announcement of his crucifixion (10:32–34).
6. Ambition of James and John reproved (10:35–45).
7. The blind man near Jericho healed (10:46–52).

IV. The Ministry in Jerusalem:
Jesus causes himself to be announced as Messiah; comes into conflict with the leaders of the people; predicts the downfall of the Jewish temple and capital (chaps. 11–13).
1. The triumphal entry; he is saluted as Messiah (11:1–11).
2. The cursing of the fig tree (11:12–14).
3. The cleansing of the temple (11:15–19).
4. Comment on the withered fig tree (11:20–25).
5. Conflict with the Jewish leaders (11:27—12:40).
   a) Christ's authority challenged (11:27–33).
   b) The parable of the vineyard (12:1–12).

c) Three questions by the Jewish rulers (12:13–34).
d) Jesus' question concerning David's son (12:35–37).
e) Warning against the scribes (12:38–40).

6. The widow's two mites (12:41–44).
7. The prophetic discourse concerning the downfall of the temple and city (chap. 13).

V. The Passion History (chaps. 14, 15).

1. The plot of the Jews (14:1, 2).
2. The anointing in the house of Simon the leper (14:3–9).
3. The bargain with Judas (14:10, 11).
4. The last Passover of Jesus and his disciples (14:12–26).
5. Prediction of Peter's denial (14:27–31).
6. The agony in Gethsemane (14:32–42).
7. The betrayal and arrest (14:43–52).
8. The trial before the Jewish authorities (14:53–65).
9. The denials of Peter (14:66–72).
10. The trial before Pilate (15:1–20).
11. The crucifixion and the death of Jesus (15:21–41).
12. The burial (15:42–47).

VI. The Resurrection of Jesus, attested by the empty tomb and the word of the young man (16:1–8).

Appendix: Summary of the appearances of Jesus (16:9–20).

Third day.—§ 35. *John the Baptist: his relation to ancient prophecy and to Jesus:* Mark 1:1–8. Note carefully the vivid picture which this paragraph gives of John and what conception it shows the early church to have had about John's relation on the one side to ancient prophecy and on the other side to Jesus. Does this make the prophet an indirect witness to Jesus himself? How far did such Scripture as Isa. 40:1–5 and Mal., chaps. 3, 4, influence: (*a*) the actions and preaching of John; (*b*) the messianic views of the early church?

Fourth day.—§ 36. *Jesus' preparation for his public work:* Mark 1:9–13. Notice first what it meant to Jesus to come to be baptized by this new prophet that had arisen and of what testimony from God in his own soul this act became the occasion. Then read vss. 12, 13, noticing that it is the Spirit of God that puts him to this test, and what is implied as to the result of the test. What impression was this story, with its record of obedience to the command of God through the prophets, its attestation from heaven, and its victorious conflict with the Evil One, calculated and intended to make on the reader, as to who and what Jesus was?

Fifth day.—§ 37. *The beginning of Jesus' public work:* Mark 1:14–45. After its brief story of John's work and of Jesus' preparation for his, the writer plunges at once, with vs. 14, into the story of Jesus' public career, the record of which continues through 13:37 (cf. the analysis). It begins in Galilee, and is crowded

full of deeds of power and words of wisdom calculated to deepen the impression and heighten the estimate which the Christians had already formed of their Master, and if the book came into the hands of any who did not yet believe in him, to arrest and command their attention also. Read 1:14–45, noticing that it is a sort of summary of how Jesus began his work, the events themselves necessarily covering considerable time. Think how this story would impress you if you were a young Christian in Rome, reading it for the first time. What were Jesus' motives and feelings in each of these events? Keep a careful list of your own impressions of Jesus' character and purpose.

Sixth day.—§ 38. *A story of growing criticism of Jesus and opposition to him:* Mark 2:1—3:6. If, when Mark wrote, this gospel was not only winning followers, but also exciting much opposition, it could not but be interesting to ask whether this fact was also true in Jesus' own day. If the gentile churches in Mark's time were still criticized for the neglect of Jewish statutes (recall what Paul had taught them), it would be pertinent to ask how Jesus stood upon this question. Read 2:1—3:6, noticing how this group of events answers both these questions. Think what use you would have made of these stories if you had been a gentile Christian of the Pauline type in the year 70 A.D. Clearly state the five accusations here recorded, and the principles for which Jesus contended. Do these principles still hold for us?

Seventh day.—§ 39. *The separating power of the gospel:* Mark 3:7—4:34 (cf. analysis). Read 3:7–35, noticing that, while many are attracted to Jesus, only a few are drawn so close to him that he can choose them to be his pupils and helpers; and some, who ought to have understood him best, call him crazy! And what startling statements Jesus makes under this pressure (3:33, 35)! Consider how these facts would affect the mind of Christians of the second and third generations. For their faith sometimes stumbled over the fact that many, even of Jesus' own nation, who might have been expected to be most ready to believe on him, strongly denied his messiahship. Then read 4:1–34, and observe how in these parables Jesus prepares the minds of his followers to expect various results from their work (4:1–9), to be patient till the harvest comes (4:26–29), but with confidence to expect in the end great results from small beginnings (4:30–32). Were these lessons as needful to the disciples of 70 A.D. as to those of 28 or 29? Recall just how far circumstances had changed in these forty years.

Eighth day.—§ 40. *The varied reception of the gospel:* Mark 4:35—6:6. Notice how varied is the attitude of different persons to Jesus: his own apostles are slow of faith, the Gerasenes urge him to leave their country, Jesus and the woman with an issue of blood show unusual faith, and his own townsmen reject him. Is the record calculated to enforce still further the lesson of the parables, and to comfort and encourage the Roman Christians, if they also find much opposition and but little faith? What impression does Jesus make in these varied

circumstances? How deeply did he feel each rebuff? Was it himself, or his message, for which he cared most at such times?

Ninth day.—§ 41. *Continuance of work in Galilee*: Mark 6:7—7:23. Observe how in the face of discouragement Jesus, strengthened by much earnest prayer, continues his work; sending out his disciples to teach and heal, himself feeding the multitudes and healing many that are sick, and combating the Pharisees in their narrowness and pettiness. Notice, too, how in all these things he is the man of power (cf. Acts 10:38); nothing is too hard for him. Is such a picture adapted to strengthen the loyalty of Mark's fellow-Christians to the Christ and to win them to him? Has the modern world clearly caught this heroic side of Jesus' life?

Tenth day.—§ 42. *Journey into gentile territory and return to Galilee:* Mark 7:24—8:26. Why this long journey into gentile territory (see 7:24, 31 and the map)? What do vss. 24–30 suggest as to the scope of Jesus' mission (cf. Rom. 1:16); and the remaining sections respecting his spirit and power?

Eleventh day.—§ 43. *Peter's confession, and Jesus' announcement of his death:* Mark 8:27—9:50 (see analysis). The critical moment in Jesus' life has come. Foreseeing that the opposition to him will almost certainly lead to his death, he takes the disciples apart for a quiet talk; and in response to Peter's first definite acknowledgment that he, Jesus, is "the Christ" (8:29), he makes the astounding announcement that he will sooner or later be rejected and put to death by the Jews (8:31 ff.)! This his disciples cannot believe. How can they, believing him to be the Christ? There is added the transfiguration experience to confirm their faith (9:2–8); on this again follow answers to their questions (9:9–13), a new deed of power (9:14–29), a fresh announcement of his death (9:30–32), and new teachings to prepare the disciples for this event (9:33–50). This is, on the whole, the most difficult portion of the gospel. Notice how many things of fundamental importance to the early church are brought out in these sections. State each principle in detail.

Twelfth day.—§ 44. *From Galilee to Judea:* Mark, chap. 10. Obliged to leave Galilee, note that Jesus now starts for Jerusalem, knowing that death awaits him there. Not all the incidents assigned to the journey perhaps reflect this fact, yet note the tenseness of his words here also; and 10:32–45 seem clearly to indicate a deepening consciousness of approaching death. Read these and vss. 17–31, as setting forth for men of later years (60–70 A.D.?) how very much it meant to be a disciple of Jesus! Would such teaching be needed in that period? Is it now?

Thirteenth day.—§ 45. *The ministry in Jerusalem:* Mark, chaps. 11, 12. With chap. 11 begins the story of Jesus' final presentation of himself to the nation and their rejection of him. See the analysis, and, as you read these chapters, notice how in connection with his entry into Jerusalem Jesus was proclaimed as the Messiah, and how patiently he continued to the end his teaching of the Jews,

seeking to make clear his message and their duty, despite the fact that he foresaw his ultimate rejection. Consider how these events would affect the mind of one (perhaps some Christian at Rome) who had believed in Jesus at the preaching of Paul or Peter or Timothy, but was now reading for the first time a story of his life. How much past Christian experience would make all these details live for the reader! What new devotion would be called out! How faltering courage would be shamed into heroic endeavor!

Fourteenth day.—§ 46. *A discourse about the future:* Mark, chap. 13. In reading this chapter, recall that Paul had taught his churches to expect the visible coming of the Lord soon, perhaps in their own day (I Thess. 4:13–18; Phil. 4:5); and that he also had occasion to explain that certain definite events would precede his coming (II Thess. 2:1–5). Consider whether this report of Jesus' words, in which are included some editorial remarks (e.g., vs. 14), and perhaps some additions from other sources (vss. 7, 8, 14–20, 24–27 are thought by some scholars to be interpolations from Jewish sources rather than from Jesus himself), is adapted to meet the same state of mind on the part of Christians of the years 60–70 A.D., who wondered why Christ had not come, and were perhaps somewhat restless. Note especially vss. 5, 6, 9, 10, 21–23, 30–33, 37.

Fifteenth day.—§ 47. *The sacrificial death of Jesus:* Mark, chaps. 14, 15. See the analysis, and as you read the story of the events that lead up to Jesus' death on the cross, consider what impression they would make upon you if you were a Christian in Rome who had read Paul's letter to the Romans with its teaching about the meaning of Jesus' death (see especially Rom. 3:21–24; 5:1–11; 6:10–12); or a Philippian who remembered Phil. 2:5–11; 3:10; or a Corinthian who had heard the preaching spoken of in I Cor. 1:23, 24; 2:1–5. What effect would it have on your faith in Jesus and your loyalty to him?

Sixteenth day.—§ 48. *The victory over death:* Mark, chap. 16. With this chapter a new note is sounded, yet Mark sees clearly that it is only the fulfilment of the prediction of 8:31. Why should not the disciples have expected an event, now deemed so natural? The Christ is victorious over those who thought they had conquered him! With vs. 8 the story breaks off abruptly, and unfinished. Vss. 9–20 are shown by internal evidence and by the ancient manuscripts to be an addition by a much later hand. Possibly we shall find in the end of Matthew something more nearly like the original conclusion of this gospel. Or do Paul's historic words (I Cor. 15:3–8) explain the tremendous upheaval which most certainly followed within a brief time?

In conclusion, think back, with the help of the analysis, over Mark's cumulative argument and ask one final question: Has the author accomplished for his readers in Rome, or elsewhere, the purpose intimated in 1:1? How is our own mind influenced?

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME XLIII FEBRUARY 1914 NUMBER 2

SHEEP IN WOLVES' CLOTHING

We ordinarily speak of wolves in sheep's clothing. They are the sort of hypocrites who try to appear better than they are. Sheep in wolves' clothing are hypocrites who try to appear worse than they are. Hypocrites of the first class are contemptible; hypocrites of the second class are debilitating.

Wolves in sheep's clothing testify to the advantages of righteousness. Sheep in wolves' clothing are among those who believe it is good policy to appear dishonest while you are honest.

Nor is this sort of hypocrisy so difficult to discover as one might wish. On every side you see men whose influence should be avowedly on the side of generous living and spiritual ambition dissembling their real motives. They do not join reforms although they sympathize with reformers; they do not sign petitions to close up saloons although they are opposed to the liquor traffic. They do not take any stand against any evil lest someone, somewhere, in some way should think them to be better than they are. They prefer to appear "men of the world" rather than men of God.

A wolf in sheep's clothing thinks with a wolf's brain and people fear him. Sheep in wolves' clothing think with sheep's brains and are neither feared nor respected.

It is difficult to be patient with men of this sort. They are worse than parasites because they fail to make people believe them; they even play at hypocrisy hypocritically.

Sometimes even genuine modesty and an ambition not to sound a trumpet before one's beneficences tend to drive men to this sort of hypocrisy.

Sincere persons are sometimes afraid that they will get too much credit for their good motives.

A corporation will justify its welfare work by the plea that it is good business, while really its motives are generous and humane.

Many a man hides a kind heart under a scowling forehead and cultivates severity that he may not be judged sentimental.

Many women whose hands are quick to do good works prefer to be known as leaders of society than as Sunday-school teachers.

Many a business man does not like to be called "deacon" although he will spend himself and his means in the service of the church.

It is easy to understand all this hesitation. An honest man knows his own frailty only too well to wish to trade upon his virtues. Such men have to suffer from the reputation of wolves in sheep's clothing.

But none the less such excessive modesty tends to perpetuate the evil it would avoid. The man who hesitates to appeal to Christian motives as the source of his actions is in danger of throwing the weight of his influence against his own ideals. The same Master who taught us not to do our works before men to be seen of them told us also to let our light so shine that men might see our good works and glorify our Father who is in heaven.

If publicity is good for trade it is good for virtue. Surreptitious goodness is apt to make men think that goodness is a thing to be ashamed of. Sheep in wolves' clothing do not make martyrs, and convictions that do not lead to martyrdom are not worth their cost of up-keep.

The call of our modern world is the call of Jesus to outspoken sincerity and consistent loyalty to the things of the Spirit.

A community is better off with wolves in sheep's clothing than with sheep in wolves' clothing. It knows what to do with wolves, but what can it do with a good man who is ashamed of his goodness?

He is as useless as the salt that has lost its savor—and more ridiculous.

THE LIFE OF JESUS IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN CRITICISM

LUCIUS HOPKINS MILLER
Professor of Biblical Instruction, Princeton University

For the intelligent layman the problems raised by biblical criticism become most acute when they concern the Gospels and the life of Christ. Many easily grant the necessity and value of applying critical tests to the Old Testament but shrink from applying them to the Gospels. This hesitation is natural and deserves consideration but it is none the less mistaken. The historical method is only "trained and informed commonsense," and those who use it seek the truth just as we all seek it in our everyday experience, only less crudely. There is no reason why the Gospels should be exempt from such a method of investigation; in fact, there is every reason why they should not be. If it is in them that we find the touchstone of our destiny, then it is incumbent upon us to make sure what that touchstone really is.

Historical criticism, applied to the Gospels and to the life of Christ, has achieved results which are sure and extensive enough to satisfy fair-minded men. Extremists of both camps will doubtless continue to wage war, but the "man in the street" is in a mood to cry, "A plague on both your houses." Even when he does not know very much about it he suspects that everything cannot be accepted; he also suspects that the truth is not along the path of sweeping denial. These suspicions turn to convictions when he seriously studies the question.

With this mood upon us, therefore, let us try to set forth the probable course of Jesus' life. Criticism, with all its detail of analysis, comparison, inference, and construction, is here assumed. Many incidents, true and important, will not be mentioned, for our aim is not a "life" but a brief sketch. The nature and content of Jesus' teaching, as such, will not be discussed. All these important matters must here be subordinated to the main aim, which is, to answer the question, "In the light of modern criticism, what is reasonably certain regarding the general course of Jesus' life?"

The Early Influences under Which Jesus Lived

The historian does not ask, "How *might* Jesus have been born?" nor, "How *must* he have been born?" but simply "Under what circumstances *was* he born?" Our sources of information do not enable us to answer explicitly. It is not clear just when he was born, nor where, nor under what circumstances. It is certain that this significant event in the history of mankind occurred near the end of the reign of Herod the Great, somewhere in what we now call Palestine. If you should press me for my opinion regarding further details, I would say that he was probably the son of Joseph and Mary and that he was born in Nazareth of Galilee.

Concerning the days of his youth and young manhood, we have no clear information. The story of his visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve (Luke 2:39–52) may not be historical, but it is certainly in keeping with any inferences that may fairly be drawn from his later development. If we are to reconstruct any picture of this period of Jesus' life, it must be by means of such inference and a few initial facts afforded us by the Gospels.

Flowing out of the past, from the Old Testament and especially from the prophets, streams of influence poured in upon him, through the channels of home and synagogue. In his reported teaching Jesus mentions by name Noah, Solomon, David, Elijah, Elisha, Jonah, and the Queen of Sheba, and there are many other references which prove that he knew the Old Testament thoroughly. Whatever else we may or may not believe regarding his conception of himself, we are constrained to hold that he considered his life and teaching the consummation of Old Testament prophecy, and that he builded consciously on the basis of truth the prophets had already laid down.

Regarding his early environment, we know that he had four brothers and at least two sisters, and it is probable that he learned the trade of his father, who was a master-builder in Nazareth. He must have been intimately acquainted with the simple, homely things of life and cognizant of all phases of the common lot of the Jews of his day. Though probably not intimate with the rich, his experience was doubtless not confined to Nazareth. It is quite likely that our mental picture should include visits to Jerusalem and to the larger towns of Galilee where Greco-Roman culture had considerable standing. The Jewish scribes undoubtedly influenced him positively as well as negatively, for, while he rejected the rabbinical system absolutely, there were broad-minded exponents of rabbinism, like Rabbi Hillel, whose loftier teaching was not unlike that of Jesus himself.

It is only fair to assume that these hereditary and environmental forces imparted form as well as content to Jesus' expanding thought, but they do not explain his exalted personality. Every life is more or less a mystery, but such a life is supremely mysterious because it is a supremely new creation. In ways that we cannot fathom, Jesus experienced during these formative years a new relationship to God. His religious consciousness was maturing along lines which constituted a new departure in man's religious history. Fused with this fundamental element of his life, there arose within him a new understanding of man's real nature and of his proper relationship to his fellowman, a new ethical consciousness. The range, quality, and significance of this new life within him could not fail to produce a peculiar self-consciousness; a realization that he, the bearer of these new spiritual gifts, stood in a peculiar relation to the Father and to his fellowmen.

We are obliged to postulate such an inner development in the days of Jesus' youth and young manhood, else his later life becomes an entire enigma. With charming characterization, the Gospel of Luke reflects the similar judgment of the early church: "And the child grew

and waxed strong in spirit" (Luke 1:80). Again: "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men" (Luke 2:52).

The Call to the Messianic Life

That John the Baptist preceded Jesus, baptized him, and in more essential ways prepared the way for him, is certain. That he sustained such a conscious relation to Jesus as the Gospels of Matthew and John record is improbable. John was largely the product of Old Testament prophecy and of the Jewish messianic hope of the Roman period. The latter gave him a hearing, the former gave him his hold. There is ample ground for the estimate of him pronounced by Jesus and treasured by Christians ever since. He stirred the religious and ethical consciousness of the people so that they were more ready for Jesus' appeal. He gathered around him a group of adherents who were thus prepared to become Jesus' chief supporters. He inaugurated the rite of baptism which, with him, differed from all previously known religious lustrations and furnished the basis for later Christian practice. Finally, he baptized Jesus himself.

The nature of the baptismal accounts and the testimony of the later parts of the Synoptic Gospels warrant our holding that, at his baptism, Jesus had an unusual inner experience which determined his whole after-life. It is not strange that his sensitive and ever-expanding consciousness should have recognized in the mission of John a peculiar significance. The previous development in Jesus' inner life would lead him to sympathize with John's movement and, with others, to join it through the rite of baptism. This notable event seems to have brought his developing experiences to a focus and to have given him divine assurance of the rightness and reality of his own relation to God and to man. It convinced him that in the propagation of his own life lay the hope of men, and naturally, being a Jew of his own time, he associated this experience and work with the messianic idea and began to think of himself, probably, as Messiah. This would mean that he considered himself the chief messenger of God to man. Whether his conviction was correct or not, that is, whether or no his vision is to be reduced to mere illusion, depends upon the nature and significance of his whole life. That alone can prove to us that his lofty self-consciousness was justified. Jesus did not relate these experiences till later in his life, and then only to his closest friends. The externalized features of the baptismal accounts in Matthew and in Luke, therefore, must be considered unhistorical.

The gaining of any new height of achievement carries with it peculiar perils, and the application of new truth to a work-a-day world presents subtle temptations. The temptation which presented itself to Jesus at this time arose from these two psychological conditions. The parabolic accounts given us by Matthew and Luke really revolve about the one thought of compromise. "Yield the truth a bit in order to get men to take it." That there was not merely one period of temptation we should have to assume, even if we did not have the story of the agony in the garden. With the author of the Epistle

to the Hebrews we can be sure that Jesus was "one that hath been in all points tempted." But, doubtless, the glory of the baptismal experience was followed by a correspondingly searching trial. Old Testament passages came to his aid. The remembrance of the recent vision was fresh upon him and girded the loins of his will. These things, together with his now vivid sense of a present Father able to help, carried him through the first great test to a life of victory over all subsequent temptations, even those of the last excruciating days. Back of the accounts lies no external struggle, nor yet a mere phantom of early interpretation. It was a real but inward event which Jesus probably related to his disciples at a later time in parabolic terms. Jesus now stands at the threshold of his life-work.

The Chronology of the Ministry

The scene and length of Jesus' activity cannot be accurately determined. The unreliability of the Fourth Gospel and the meagerness of the Synoptics leave the matter in the twilight. Whether his ministry lasted one year or three, we cannot say. How much time he spent in Galilee, Perea, Samaria, and Judea, respectively, we cannot tell. It it certain that until the last days he was chiefly in Galilee. But he spent some time in Perea also and undoubtedly visited Samaria. It is probable, also, that he went to Judea and Jerusalem during his ministry, that is, before the final journey that ended with his death. It is Galilee, however, which looms largest in our records, then Jerusalem in the last days and, to a lesser degree, Perea.

The Early Preaching

We are told that he began in Galilee to preach the "gospel of the kingdom." What that "good news" was we shall not discuss here. The effect of his preaching was, at first, a general impression of authority. Mark says: "And they were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes." This, of course, was not any external or official authority. The scribes possessed that sort of authority and they had been weighed in the balance and found wanting. Nor was it merely because he considered himself to be the Messiah. It was because he was what he was.

Besides preaching, Jesus certainly performed acts of healing, chiefly on those who thought themselves possessed by demons. He doubtless healed other disorders and diseases also. The motive of this activity was not the exhibition of power for the sake of proving his messiahship, or his divinity, as John pictures it. At this time, at least, he kept to himself his thoughts of himself and he discouraged his followers from giving an undue prominence either to his works or to himself. The motive back of this, as of all his activity, was that of love, and Matthew is right in quoting in this connection a passage from Second Isaiah (Isa. 53:4): "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."

The result of all this teaching and of his many deeds of kindness, evidencing his great love of his fellows was an unbounded popularity. He was not thereby deceived, however. He knew that the real advance of the kingdom whose interests he had at heart was taking

place only slowly and in varying degrees The parable of the Sower reveals this. "Behold, the sower went forth to sow; and as he sowed, some seeds fell by the wayside, and the birds came and devoured them: and others fell on the rocky places, where they had not much earth; and straightway they sprang up, because they had no deepness of earth: and when the sun was risen, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And others fell among thorns; and the thorns grew up and choked them; and others fell upon the good ground, and yielded fruit, some a hundred fold, some sixty, some thirty" (Matt. 13:3–9). He knew that the hold he had on the many was too slight to keep them from losing interest when difficulties arose.

Early Difficulties

These difficulties soon came, for Jesus' plain speaking quickly aroused the opposition of the rabbis and brought about the great conflict which culminated at the cross. In Mark 3:6 we read: "And the Pharisees went forth and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him." John 6:66 accurately represents the effect of this opposition upon the mass of his following in words which, however, are given a different historical setting: "From that time many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him." Mark 7:24 describes the effect on Jesus' own plans: "And from thence he arose and went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon [that is, outside the immediate sphere of the rabbis' influence] and entered into an house, and would have no man know it." In short the rabbis effectually stopped Jesus' extended public activity in Galilee and obliged him to withdraw to quieter scenes with a small band of devoted disciples.

Jesus now realizes clearly the necessity of intensive work with the few instead of extensive work with the many. He rightly estimates the final result of the rabbinical campaign against him and begins to forecast the final issue. Either they must change, or he must yield, or he must die. That they would change he knew to be most improbable, that he should yield was impossible. He must have seen, therefore, that his death was inevitable and he must have begun, at least, to work out the reasonableness of it in order to bring it into harmony with his idea of God and with his own relation to the Father. Thoughts like that of Mark 10:45 must have been in his mind increasingly: "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." How far Jesus went toward a solution of this dark problem we do not know and he leaves us free to form our own theories of it. The Gospels support the conclusion to which our natural inferences would lead. He at least submitted to his fate, believing it to be the will of God and believing, also, that his death would, in some way, advance the interests of the kingdom.

For a time he kept all these thoughts to himself. The disciples were not prepared to understand or to endure them. Weeks of close intercourse, however, in these days of comparative retirement, must have enlightened their minds and strengthened their wills. At any rate,

at the end of his sojourn in the northern districts, Jesus seems to have broken to them his dire forebodings. In Mark, these teachings do not appear until the time of Peter's confession, and the psychological situation makes this view of the matter so fitting that we may conclude that any contrary representation found in the other gospels is due to unhistorical transposition or to later reflection.

The Change at Caesarea Philippi

Peter's confession came as a result of the close association with Jesus during the days of retirement in the north, and it was evidently of great significance both to Jesus and to his disciples. The Markan account (Mark 8:27–30) reads: "And Jesus went forth, and his disciples into the villages of Caesarea Philippi: and on the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, 'Who do men say that I am?' And they told him, saying, 'John the Baptist; and others, Elijah; but others, one of the Prophets.' And he asked them, 'But who say ye that I am?' Peter answereth and saith unto him, 'Thou art the Christ.' And he charged them that they should tell no man of him." In John, this important event is given another historical setting and the passage shows signs of the author's peculiar viewpoint, but the essential content is the same: "Upon this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Jesus said therefore unto the twelve, 'Would ye also go away?' Simon Peter answered him, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God'" (John 6:66–69).

Jesus felt that he had been deserted by all but the very few. If they did not maintain their faith in him, no one would. There was great risk in thus forcing the issue but he accepted it. Great souls must always take chances and cast the die. The test was successful. He was able to clinch their faith in him, temporarily at least. This partially fortified them against the difficulties of the teaching he was about to give them, and of the heart-searching experiences through which they were all so soon to go.

Jesus' Expectation of Death and Resurrection

According to Mark and the other Synoptic Gospels which follow Mark's order of events, immediately after Peter's confession Jesus began to emphasize the suffering and death to come. In Mark 8:31–37 we read: "And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But he, turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, 'Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men.' And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it. For what doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? For

what should a man give in exchange for his life?' "

To this passage we may add Mark 9:9–10: "And as they were coming down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen again from the dead. And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean." Also, Mark 9:31–32: "For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, 'The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again.' " And Mark 10:33–34: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the Gentiles: and they shall mock him, and shall spit upon him, and shall scourge him, and shall kill him; and after three days he shall rise again." And finally, Mark 10:45, already quoted: "For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."

We must bear in mind, in using these passages, the probability of their reflecting in part the views of a later time when the death and resurrection of Jesus had acquired paramount importance and a more definite significance. It seems to me, however, that we may fairly conclude from them that Jesus spoke of his death at this time and that he considered it God's will for him. The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah would help him reach the conclusion that suffering belonged to the Messiah's part. His death would thus present itself to him as the logical outcome, under the circumstances, of his life-principle of love and service and also, probably, as a means of blessing to many. We should have to assume the rise in his mind of thoughts like these, had we no references at all purporting to give his direct teaching.

Similarly, with regard to the specific sayings referring to his resurrection, it may be that these verses merely record what, in the light of their experiences, later disciples thought he must have said. Doubtless the definiteness of some of the statements is due to this fact. But, on the other hand, it is hard to believe that Jesus' own thoughts did not run out beyond his death. His faith in the Father and in the supreme worth of his own life and mission would not allow him to stop there. Furthermore, it is inconceivable that he would impart to his followers his innermost fears regarding the end of his life and work without communicating to them also whatever he had within him of faith, hope, and encouragement. We may not know just what he thought or said. Probably we do not know. But that he himself anticipated his death, without anticipating anything more, is out of keeping with his whole view of things. And that he consciously led his disciples to anticipate his death, without leading them any further into paths of faith and hope, is equally out of keeping.

In John 14:16–20 we read: "And I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him: for he abideth

with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you. Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me: because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." These words cannot be taken as coming from Jesus himself, for they are thoroughly characteristic of the phraseology and point of view of the author of the Fourth Gospel. But, nevertheless, they represent for me what must actually have been the essential trend of Jesus' thought at this time and, as I have already indicated, what he himself thought he must, under the circumstances, have communicated to his disciples in some form or other.

If the transfiguration story is not entirely a myth, back of the evident legendary embellishments there may lie a real experience of an exalted nature—an experience which Jesus shared with his closest friends, growing out of the kind of conversation that was now uppermost with them. The accounts which we have of the event connect it with this point in Jesus' life, and with the very circle of thought we have just been considering. This experience, if such there was, must have led to a further strengthening of the faith of the three disciples immediately concerned—Peter, James, and John. If these inferences are at all warrantable, we have here another example of the intensive effort Jesus now felt called upon to put forth that his work might survive his impending death.

The Last Journey to Jerusalem

With such heartening memories Jesus "sets his face toward Jerusalem." His state of mind seems to have been one of exaltation tinged, however, with natural forebodings. In Mark 10:32 we read: "And they were on the way, going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them the things that were to happen unto him." Here we see Jesus, brave, hopeful, and even triumphant, marching through Perea beyond Jordan, with Jerusalem as his goal, "knowing the things that should befall him there."

Mark, our earliest source, indicates that in this brief period before the end, Jesus again engaged in more public activity. Mark 10:1 reads: "And he arose from thence, and cometh into the borders of Judaea and beyond the Jordan: and multitudes come together unto him again; and, as he was wont, he taught them again." Mark assigns to this period a considerable amount of undoubtedly genuine teaching. Luke gathers together at this point a much larger amount of Jesus' teaching, drawn partly from the "Logia document" and partly from his own independent sources (cf. Luke, chaps. 9–18). Luke's arrangement here is undoubtedly topical because Matthew gives many parallels to these sections of Luke, but places them in different historical settings. The common idea of Jesus' "Perean ministry," so-called, is drawn from Luke and therefore needs to be modified by the considerations just mentioned; but, it is undoubtedly a fact that Jesus repeated in Perea, though in smaller degree, the public activity which marked his earlier work in Galilee.

A few short crowded days in the Jewish capital, and the machinations of the leaders of his people were crowned with success. Jesus was tried, tortured, and executed. Out of the many events and voluminous teaching of these last days many of our most precious gospel traditions come. To be sure, accretions have crept into the teaching and incidents have been added without warrant. A simple parting-meal has been started on its course of transformation into a miraculous mystery, and in the Fourth Gospel Jesus is represented discoursing in the terms of Alexandrian philosophy. In general, however, the tradition is sound and we get a more detailed picture of Jesus here than at any other point in his life. To reproduce this picture would transgress the limits of our space and is hardly necessary. A few illustrations will bring to mind the exceptional quantity and quality of Jesus' activity in these days.

In spite of the plots of his enemies, he received homage in private from individuals, and in public from the many, especially from the provincials thronging to the Passover. There is no reason to doubt the story of the "anointing at Bethany," nor the main fact of the "triumphal entry." After his Galilean and Perean triumphs, he would naturally be the center of attention at the great feast and would arouse enthusiasm among the many representatives from these provinces. The latter story had doubtless been embellished, however, to make it fit into Old Testament prophecy. Similarly, the story of the "cursing of the fig tree" is probably an example of the development of a parable into a miracle.

The Last Week in Jerusalem

One of the most interesting phases of the last week of Jesus' life is his direct clash with the authorities. We feel the thrill that manifestations of righteous indignation always cause, and we get a new conception of the way in which virility and loving-kindness may be united in the harmony of a single ideal. According to the Gospel of John, Jesus began his work with the so-called "cleansing of the temple," and we therefore usually assume that there were two occasions on which Jesus performed this act. Undoubtedly the Synoptics are right in placing this striking event at the end of Jesus' life, and the author of John has transferred it to the beginning for some reason of his own and in disregard of the historical facts.

The record we have of the questions put to Jesus by the Jewish leaders and of Jesus' answers is undoubtedly reliable. This is just what we should expect from the rabbis in their effort to secure some basis for a valid charge against the Galilean. The only result of their questions has been to provide us with a permanent proof, not only of Jesus' superior moral insight, but also of his great intellectual acumen. These questions and answers paved the way naturally for a final invective on the part of Jesus against rabbinism and against its representatives. Seldom have men been so scathingly and yet so justly excoriated. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also appear righteous unto men, but inwardly ye are full

of hypocrisy and iniquity" (Matt. 23:27–28).

How much of the reported discourses, about the coming of the kingdom (Matt., chap. 24; Mark, chap. 13; Luke, chap. 21), comes from Jesus, and how much from early Christian tradition, is impossible to say. Doubtless Jesus discussed these subjects at length with his disciples, especially at the close of his life, but we cannot be sure of the drift of these discussions.

It would seem as if the Fourth Gospel's account of the "Last Supper" were more true to fact than the accounts given by the other three. John relates the circumstances very simply and joins with the account of the Supper itself that of the symbolic act of "Jesus washing the disciples' feet." The Synoptics append to the record of the customary meal, with its discussion of "the betrayal," an account of the special institution by Jesus of an unusual rite, symbolic of his death and of its religious significance. The synoptic account is probably colored by later ideas, but in any case, the last meal of the disciples with Jesus must have been impressive and significant both to them and to him.

But we must not follow the details further. Jesus maintained his cause to the very end, battling in virile fashion against the enemies from without and against those "that were of his own household." His followers were evidently always in his thought and he spent much time preparing them for the inevitable outcome. He himself turned continually to the Father in the spirit of the garden prayer, "Not my will, but thine, be done." Jesus' death has been theologized out of all true perspective. The unalterable fact that it was the climax of his life of love and service has thereby been attested, but often in unmeaning, if not actually illogical and anti-ethical, terms. We do not have to be trained theologians to understand either the necessity of the cross or its main significance. The essential values of this supreme event lie near the surface, but they also run down deep into the very heart of the meaning of life.

The Resurrection

We must now endeavor to present the probable facts underlying the resurrection stories, and estimate their significance. The signs and portents, the empty grave, the definite period of three days, the physical appearances, the forty-day period and the ascension—all these may best be put one side. We have to choose between an objectively real, but non-physical, manifestation of the spirit of Jesus, and some kind of vision theory. The first is easy to understand, granted the main fact, because it requires little psychological preparation on the part of the disciples. On the other hand, it is a bit harder to accept than the second because we make so much of the psychological in these days. However, through the activities of the Society of Psychical Research, we have latterly become much more accustomed to the thought of the possibility of this sort of event. In fact, there is no insuperable difficulty in the way of the modern man who inclines to the acceptance of this first explanation. On the contrary, certain tendencies in modern psychology and philosophy pave the way to such a belief.

The second theory would necessitate an explanation something like this: Jesus' impartation of spiritual life to his followers, especially to the receptive and impressionable Peter, was too great to be wiped out even by so paralyzing and unintelligible a calamity as his death. Certain words of Jesus, conveying hope at a time when all seemed dark, would linger in the mind. It may also be that these words expressed a belief in a speedy return and establishment of the kingdom. After the first despair, due to Jesus' departure, the new life they possessed from him was brought to a focus by their return to Galilee, and possibly, also, by definite forecasts of their Master. It then produced in these men, of an age, race, and clime predisposing them to such things, and first of all in Peter, whose individual temperament was most favorable to such impressions, a series of "visions." These were inner, spiritual experiences, easily propagated from individual to individual, and from individuals to groups. Thus they spread, probably from Peter first, as the records all suggest, and in every case colored, most naturally, by the content of Jesus' personality by which their lives were dominated.

On either of these two theories, the relation of our existing gospel accounts of the resurrection to the original experience would be the same. The actual event, whatever it was, little by little became materialized in the progress of the tradition until the narratives become what they now are.

For a modern man, as it seems to me, the choice lies solely between these two views. In either case, the resurrection accounts prove the actual existence of a spiritual life and power which enabled men to brave danger and death in an unpopular cause, for an unpopular person; a spiritual life and power which, on sure historical grounds, we can connect with the life of Jesus of Nazareth; a spiritual life and power which, through these men, has come down through the centuries in ever-increasing fulness, purity, and beneficence. These facts must be interpreted in accordance with the thought-atmosphere of our age, but they must be interpreted, and no interpretation is true to fact which does not recognize the spiritual supremacy of Jesus of Nazareth in the life of the world. Thus, instead of a supposedly objective physical fact, supporting a structure full of mysterious dogmas, we get an objective, or at least equally real, spiritual fact—a mass of such facts, indeed—which goes to support the reality and supremacy of the spiritual life of Jesus. Through him we may rise to belief in a God, of like-minded love and righteousness, whose hands direct the destinies of the whole universe of men and things.

THUS SAITH JEHOVAH!

To church members whose ecclesiastical complacency blinds them to the social obligations of religion:

Trust ye not in lying words, saying, "The church of God, the church of God, the church of God are these buildings and these services."

For if ye reform your methods and your business,
If ye thoroughly execute justice between a man and his neighbor,
If ye take no advantage of the immigrant, the fatherless, and the widow
And shed no innocent blood,
Neither walk (to your own hurt) after other gods,
Then will I establish your nation in the land which I gave to your fathers.

Behold, ye trust in lying words that cannot profit!
Will ye steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, worhsip the God of success, walk after any other god that ye may hear of, and then come and stand before me in your church which you have called the house of God and say: "We are saved!"?

Will you thus justify your abominable things?

Has this church, called by my name, become a den of robbers?

Go to the sacred place of Shiloh where I caused my name to dwell at the first. See what I did to Shiloh because of the wickedness of my people!

I WILL DO UNTO THIS CHURCH WHICH IS CALLED BY MY NAME, IN WHICH YE TRUST, AND UNTO THE COUNTRY WHICH I GAVE TO YOU AND YOUR FATHERS, AS I DID TO SHILOH!

AND I WILL CAST YOU OUT OF MY SIGHT.—JER. 7:2–30.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH FEDERATION
I. INDEPENDENCY AND AUTONOMY

A. W. ANTHONY
Chairman of Commission on State and Local Federation, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

At the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, held in Baltimore, Maryland, December 3–5, 1913, definitions were given and distinctions drawn concerning the character and relations to each other of the various kinds of federations already in existence. A restatement of some of the paragraphs in the report of the Commission on State and Local Federations, and of parts of the discussions of the occasion will be of service to all those interested in this vital matter.

The Mutual Relations of Federations and the Federal Council

Federations, whether in a city, county, state, or the nation, have an independency and autonomy which must not be overlooked. Each kind springs up as a native and original growth out of its constituent elements—the city federation out of local churches within a city for the purpose of expressing common ideals and objects, or of doing specific work, desired by all, but impossible for each separately to do, or at least separately to do as well; the state federation out of the denominational organizations within a state for objects and purposes shared in by all; and the Federal Council out of its constituent elements, which are the nation-wide denominational organizations. In each instance the authority of the federation, or of the Federal Council, arises from the mutual agreements made in the organization by the bodies combining. There is no authority from a superior body or over-lord of any kind. No charters have been granted, or enabling acts passed, by the Federal Council or by any upper body which allows the lower to exist.

The Federal Council has above it no other body legislating concerning its functions and proceedings, limiting its powers, or defining its possibilities. So far as superior bodies are concerned it is free; nevertheless it is amenable to the lower bodies which have created it, and, acting in their behalf, can act only so far as they authorize action. A state federation likewise has above it no authoritative control; it exists because its constituent elements called it into being; the Federal Council did not create it; it sustains no dependent relations to the Federal Council; its tasks and its functions are those which the constituent parts desire, order, and permit. The city federation or other local federation whether of a town or county, in a similar manner derives its right to be, not from a state federation, nor from the Federal Council, but from its component and constituent parts, and exercises those functions, peculiar to itself, or like unto those of others, as

the case may be, which these component and constituent parts in each instance may agree upon or decree.

In general the Federal Council is busied with religious, moral, and ecclesiastical subjects of a nation-wide or of a world-wide character. State federations are engaged with such questions as relate locally to the interests of the state; and more frequently the judicial functions of determining rights and proprieties between denominational organizations, in the exercise of their home mission duties within the state, must be brought into action; while in the city or local federation, although questions of almost every character which bear upon municipal and local conditions receive consideration, yet the functions are largely of an executive nature, such as pertain to parish-districting, to united effort for the application and enforcement of law, and the creation and mobilization of public sentiment for ethical and moral praxis.

The Terminology of Federated Activities

The federative ideal, expressing a principle, does not require a uniform constitution of fixed phrases, but may find expression in as varied forms as there are places and people. Standard forms of organization and of terminology may suggest useful ideals, but carry with them no inherent virtue, and require no subservient imitation. Variety is not only permissible, but, because conditions in different localities vary, is necessary for adaptation to locality.

No uniform name need be employed for the designation of a federation. It may be called a league, a union, an association, a council, a commission, a federation, or any other descriptive term, coupled with any adjective or noun carrying qualifying attributes, such as inter-church, interdenominational, united, general, federated, church, of the church, or of churches. The principle is larger than a name, and may be included in an entire vocabulary. No brand nor trade-mark has been put upon the principle, although common designations are preferable for the sake of quick and easy understanding.

The Commission on State and Local Federations, in gathering data for a directory of federations, listed, among federations already in existence, one league, one union, one association, three commissions, seventeen councils, and ninety-five federations. As a qualifying adjective, applied to these federations, the word "comity" is used once, "united" once, "general" once, "interdenominational" four times, "federated" nine times, and "inter-church" thirty-nine times. It would appear, therefore, that the composite name, like a composite photograph, which is gradually emerging from free and independent use, is the name "inter-church federation." For new organizations it seems advisable to avoid in the future the use of the name "council" for a state or local federation, inasmuch as that is the technical designation of the national organization.

The Co-operating Denominations

The independency and autonomy of federations should be recognized also in the determination of membership. As an indigenous product each federation must grow out of the soil in which the seed becomes implanted, in which the roots find nourishment, from which the

sap flows, and for which the life finds expression. Of state and local federations already in existence not one includes all of the denominations which are members of the Federal Council of Churches. Some are composed of but few denominations; others of comparatively many. Some include organizations outside of the church; not a few have in their membership bodies entirely unrelated with the Federal Council. The limitation, the extension, the inclusion, or the exclusion of the membership of state and local federations need not concern the Federal Council, since the Federal Council has neither called these federations into existence, nor is responsible for their specific agreements and functions.

In the list of federations compiled for the directory of federations are included twenty-one state federations, eighty-one city federations, and thirteen county or district federations, making a total of one hundred and fifteen federations. Others are in process of formation; some have already existed and ceased to be. Those are now tabulated which are in active existence, or at least have officers and organizations ready for activity. How widespread and inclusive of churches and organizations is the federative ideal may be seen from the following table, which gives the number of federations in which the different denominations are represented:

Denominations	Number of Different Federations
Methodist Episcopal church North	107
Baptist churches North	96
Congregational church	85
Presbyterian church in the United States of America	82
Protestant Episcopal church, or its commissions on Christian Unity and Social Service	58
Christian church	39
Lutheran church, General Synod	37
United Presbyterian church	37
United Brethren church	31
Disciples of Christ	21
Friends	31
Evangelical Association	21
African Methodist Episcopal church	17
Methodist Protestant church	17
Reformed church in the United States (German)	15
African Methodist Episcopal Zion church	14
Free Baptist churches	13
German Evangelical Synod	13
National Baptist Convention (colored)	12
Methodist Episcopal church South	12
United Evangelical church	12
Reformed church in America (Dutch)	11
Primitive Methodist church	9
Presbyterian church (South) in United States	8
Welsh Presbyterian church	6
Moravian church	5
Reformed Episcopal church	4
Reformed Presbyterian church, General Synod	4
Seventh Day Baptist church	3
Mennonite church	1
Colored Methodist Episcopal church in America	1

All of the above-named churches are national, denominational organizations which are constituent bodies of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

In the following table is a list of organizations also represented in the membership of state and local federations, but not included in the membership of the Federal Council. The names employed are not the technical, ecclesiastical names, but the more popular designations.

Bodies	Number of Different Federations
Universalist churches	25
Unitarian churches	24
Church of the New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian)	6
Advent Christian	6
Salvation Army	5
Young Men's Christian Association	5
"Pentecostal"	4
English Lutheran	3
Swedish Lutheran	2
Roman Catholic	2
Congregational Methodists	1
Free Methodists	1
Cumberland Presbyterians	1
Volunteers of America	1
Dunkards	1
Calvinistic Methodists	1
Catholic Apostolic	1
"Holiness"	1
Woman's Christian Temperance Union	1
Wesleyan Methodist Episcopal	1
Reformed Evangelical	1
United Norwegian Lutheran	1
Greek Orthodox	1
"Lutheran Missouri"	1

These tables show plainly that the spirit of co-operation has taken possession of fifty-five denominations and organizations closely related to the church, and indicate clearly that already in some form of federation, city, county, or state, bodies are combined without reference to tests of creed, or method, or object, at least in any rigid effort toward standardization or conformity. Variety is not only permissible, but is in practice, and varied forms of organization are already in sympathetic fellowship and practical co-operation for specific ends within definite areas.

From the reports which have come to hand it is apparent that not a few state and local federations, once promising and exuberant in the zeal of their beginnings, have ceased activity and are dormant, if not indeed defunct. Not infrequently the failure of a federation is due to its lack of independency; it has not represented its own constituency, nor been true to its own environment, but has undertaken, by imitation, to follow the plans and methods of some other federation which did not fit and apply to its own locality. A comprehensive program, an ideal form of organization, a specific task which belongs appropriately to one federation, may have no place in another; and if the second body without regard for its own genius, its own peculiar situation and surroundings, undertakes to imitate the other, it will fail to draw the vital forces out of its constituent elements which make it capable of life and usefulness. A federation can have no better aim than to discover the needs and opportunities peculiar to its own place, whether state or city, and to express the purposes and convictions which spring naturally and almost inevitably out of the elements of which it is composed. Because it is autochthonous it must be autonomous.

The Danger Threatening Federations

Behind federations, therefore, lurks, as an insidious peril to conscience and honest convictions, no arbitrary effort at standardization, no uncompromising spirit of coercion, no germ of modern inquisition infecting men with a mania for conformity. Every church, every denomination, and every combination of churches and denominations retains its own peculiarities, its own independency and responsibility. Neither surrender nor compromise is required.

Co-operation secures contact at points of similarity, without loss of individualism. Those who have feared the word "federation," as though it in some way involved an unholy alliance with persons and things not one's own, may lay their fears aside, for there is no instance in the record of modern federations of a man's losing or even compromising his own individuality, his own conscience and conviction, while co-operating with others for the objects and in the work which appeals to the consciences and convictions of all. One man uses his own strength of muscle and determined will as much when pulling on a rope with twenty others, as though he were pulling alone, but when working with others his efforts are much more effective; indeed twenty-one men together can accomplish tasks which are wholly impossible to one man alone. Socialized activity is not incompatible with individualism, for individualism comes to its best expression when in friendly, co-operative alliance with others. Of the nine fruits of the spirit, named by the apostle Paul, at least six are social and can come into expression only as the individual is associated with others—namely, love, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, and meekness; while the other three—joy, faith, and temperance—depend in no small degree upon the fellowship of others.

THE BIBLE AS MATERIAL FOR SEX INSTRUCTION

REV. JAMES PERKINS BURLING
Pastor Greenwood Church, Des Moines, Iowa

Education in sex morality is always in danger of undoing its own ideals. At least in part, it is for this reason that the Roman Catholic church is so much opposed to the teaching of eugenics in the public schools. There is constant danger lest the really moral aspect of the entire matter be lost in the biological.

Mr. Burling has called attention to an important asset which the church has for its conduct of the right sort of sex education. Even though our readers may not agree with all that he says, they will be sure to appreciate the main point which he presses home so vigorously.

Sex questions are before the public today as never before. From every quarter the subject is thrust upon our attention. City governments are busy with vice investigations. The doctors are concerned with eugenics. The plays of Brieux and others of his school are on the stage. In the realm of fiction, one could not throw a stone anywhere in a modern bookstore without hitting

half a dozen novels dealing with problems of sex. The "conspiracy of silence" is certainly broken, but whether the resulting "noise" is to be preferred to the preceding "silence" is still a question in many minds. Particularly open to doubt is the general demand that the facts of sex be taught in our public schools. By having the subject kept before the minds of the young will not the result be just the reverse from that hoped for? As a matter of fact, boys do not need "instruction." Nature instructs them herself. Perverted tendencies need to be corrected, but not by any elaborate system of "instruction." Any wise doctor can tell a boy in ten minutes all he needs to know about the physiological aspects of sex. There is nothing better that an adolescent boy can do in regard to the whole matter, than to ignore it. Let him become absorbed in athletics, kodakery, flying machines, mandolin clubs, anything in short to which he can devote his interest, and in which he can become absorbed. The boy does not need constant "instruction." He needs to be taught reserve and reverence, pure conceptions of the place and dignity of sex. He also needs a few warnings.

Now it seems strange that we have failed to see how incomparably rich the Bible is in material for such teaching. The teacher of the boys' Bible class has the best opportunity of all for just the right sort of teaching, and no better textbook could be asked for than the one in his hands—the Old and New Testaments.

The Sunday school is greatly superior to the public schools as a place for sex instruction. There is the natural division into boys' and girls' classes. There are the moral and religious background and atmosphere. The Sabbath day and the church building inspire reverence. There are the personal relation and interest of the teachers in the members of his class. The subject may come up naturally and not be artificially imposed and the Bible is the textbook. In the Bible we find perfect frankness and perfect reserve. Never sensational, the Bible writers neither overemphasize nor underemphasize the place of sex, but always treat it as a matter-of-fact element in human life. The Bible draws the most repellent pictures of depraved sex life found in any literature. It also ennobles the conception of sex by showing its worth when devoted to the purposes for which it was intended.

Take the very first instance in Gen. 1:27: "Male and female created he them." The creation of sex is the climax of the whole sublime story of creation. This great division of the human race is a part of the divine creation—created according to divine ideals, for certain great divine ends. Let the attention of a class of boys or young men be called to the fact that sex is a part of divine creation, and the subject is immediately ennobled and dignified in the boys' mind. This first mention in Genesis strikes the keynote for the treatment throughout the Bible. By using the biblical material the teacher can lead the boy to regard with reverence and reserve both his own and the opposite sex. This, too, without the unhealthful curiosity certain to be aroused by physiological presentation in the public schools. Reverence is the great word.

The Bible is equally rich in material

for warnings. Its references to sexual vice are never morbid or sensational. There are throughout the biblical accounts of such sin, pathos, an unspeakable sadness. It is man—man created in the image of God—who has gone astray. There is no unnecessary elaboration. I remember reading aloud without comment, the ninth chapter of Proverbs to a class of older boys. There was a pause after the last verse: "He knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her guests are in the depths of hell." The silence that followed was marked. The effect was intense and permanent. I dismissed the class without a word.

Now it is a well-known psychological fact that in dealing with an unpleasant subject, where we intend to arouse repulsion, we often succeed in stirring only a horrible fascination. A teacher may talk for an hour on the evils of cigarette smoking—illustrating his lecture with charts of gaily colored stomachs and lungs of cigarette smokers. When the lecture is over and the boys are on their way home, every boy may light his cigarette, fascinated by the pictures he has seen. I leave the explanation to the psychologists—the fact is there.

Many "warnings" against sexual vice somehow have the same effect—a minimum of repulsion, and a maximum of fascination. But in the Bible warnings there is a maximum of repulsion—and no fascination.

The question, why Bible writers can do that which most of us fail to do in our own language, admits of a number of answers. There is, for one answer, the divine inspiration of the scriptures, which gives them that which no merely human writing can possess. Then, too, there is the effect due partly to the literary style and the symbolism used. Certain it is that the Bible pictures stir repulsion and never fascination. "Many strong men have been slain by her. Her house is the way to hell—going down to the chambers of death. . . . . And thou mourn at the last when thy flesh and thy body are consumed."

The story in the twenty-fifth chapter of Numbers is open to the same treatment. In this picture also we find horror without fascination. There is nothing to stir an unwholesome curiosity. Young men should be taught to treat matters of sex with seriousness. There is a tragic solemnity in the twenty-fifth chapter of Numbers that cannot be evaded nor forgotten.

The story of Joseph's temptation is unrivaled in its simplicity, its frankness, its fidelity to nature, its superb moral influence. It is important to note that Joseph makes use of the religious motive only: "How then can I do this great wickedness and sin against God."

In the demand for sex instruction in the public schools, the movement seldom rises above the physical, the relation of vice to the health of the body. There is little use of moral and none at all of religious motives. The teacher of the boys' Bible class has the unique privilege of using both the physical and the religious motives. Vice destroys the body, but, more than that, it is contrary to the law of God, and destroys the soul.

There have been two groups of people notable for the high standard of purity that has prevailed among them: one,

the Jewish people, the other, our own Puritan ancestors. Both made daily use of the Scriptures as a part of the education of their youth, which is evidence of the fitness of the scriptures for material in sex education.

SHALL THE CHURCHES TAKE PSYCHICAL RESEARCH SERIOUSLY?

GEORGE BARTON CUTTEN, Ph.D., D.D.
President of Acadia University, Wolfville, Nova Scotia
Author of "The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity"

Thirty years ago if a man had talked seriously about ghosts, he would probably have been set down as simple-minded, or as a spiritualist. It is still difficult for some of us to feel that people can believe in the sobriety of men who investigate ghost stories, attend seances, and write articles on communications from the dead. It may be, however, that this is only a part of our intellectual provincialism. At any rate, a moment's thought will make it evident that religion is interested in any attempt at understanding immortality. If such an attempt is ill advised it will work harm; if it is really significant it may serve, as many claim, to corroborate the stories of the resurrection. There is no man better able to give this delicate but serious matter a judicial treatment than President Cutten.

It is now over thirty years since the English Society for Psychical Research was formed, and we have a right to ask for the results of their application of scientific principles to certain obscure psychical phenomena. Surely by this time the Society has something to report from its own work in addition to the results of the labors of similar societies in Germany and the United States, and from independent investigations in other countries. Not only is the general public interested, but the churches are asking questions, for one line of the Society's investigations has a religious significance second to none with which science is dealing today.

The presidential address of Sir Oliver Lodge before the last meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science has been more discussed than any address of its kind previously given in recent years. It was an index of the *Zeitgeist.* Thirty-nine years ago the late lamented Professor Tyndall delivered his famous Belfast address before the same association. At that time he attacked the arrogance of dogmatic theology, with noteworthy effect. Sir Oliver Lodge evidently thinks we have exchanged one despot for another, and finds it necessary to attack the arrogance of dogmatic science. This is all the more a subject of amazement, for the fundamental claim of

science is that it approaches all lines of investigation with an open mind, while theology, receiving as it does (or did) its material from a definite revelation, never made any such pretense.

It was not, however, the general charge of the dogmatic and narrow attitude of science which caused this address to make such an impression, but rather the specific charge made as an illustration of the main contention. The speaker said that the scientists of today refused to accept any fact which could not be explained in terms of physics and chemistry, while there was a large body of facts which could not be explained in this way and which needed explanation. The learned speaker definitely stated that these facts seemed to him to be only explicable on the hypothesis of the continuance of life after death, and the communication between living persons and those who had died. With such a pronouncement as this it behooves us to ask the question: "Shall the churches take psychical research seriously?"

What Is Psychical Research?

To answer this question intelligently it is first necessary for us to know what we mean by psychical research. A society was formed in England in 1882 under this name, the occasion of whose beginning was the refusal of the scientific societies of England to publish further evidence on behalf of thought-transference, or telepathy as it is now called. This society has continued its work during the years since then, expending money, time, and patience—infinite patience.

The subjects investigated by this society have been unusual but not necessarily supernormal. The object has been to collect facts of all sorts of human experiences bordering on the supernormal, and to preserve records of experiences which are not now of special interest. The society has always subordinated explanation to the presentation of facts and has always been ready to publish details of unusual facts regardless of what they proved or disproved, for as a scientific society its object was the collection of facts upon which to found a theory rather than the proving of any particular theory. The subjects dealt with may be classified under five heads, viz., (1) hypnotism and automatisms; (2) telepathy and clairvoyance; (3) apparitions (ghosts); (4) premonitions and previsions; (5) spiritism. The society has aimed to approach these problems without prejudice, in the same spirit which has enabled science to solve so many problems, some of which were originally as debatable as these.

The Actual Results Attained

Of the results of the labors of the Society much may be said. Both the science and the art of hypnotism have been investigated so that now they are understood and their laws are known—say, about as well as those of normal sleep. Automatisms are also familiar phenomena now, and the mysteries have been eliminated from the conception of them.

Telepathy is still debatable, but many accept the fact as proved, although at a loss to understand or define its laws. It is certain that association of ideas, muscle reading, unconscious whispering, coincidence, or any other known causes are sufficient to explain only a portion of

the cases, and telepathy seems to be warranted as a hypothesis for the remainder.

Such works as Gurney's *Phantasms of the Living* show the immense amount of labor which has been expended to solve the question of apparitions, the "census of hallucinations" being the basis of the conclusions. Many remarkable coincidences (if such is the explanation) have been attested of the appearance of the apparition of a person at the time of his death.

A large number of cases of premonitions and previsions have also been collected and work is being continued along this line.

Little or no further work will probably be done on hypnotism, for of this there is little need, except in so far as the hypnotic state may be favorable for the investigation of another subject, telepathy for example.

"Spiritism"

The other three subjects are still under consideration and promise speedy solution. It is about the last subject, spiritism, that the war is waged most fiercely, and to most persons the Society for Psychical Research is nothing more than a lot of people trying to induce others to believe in spiritism regardless of the validity of the evidence; at best they are a weak people easily deceived, but they may be worse.

It is true that the cult known as spiritualism and the people known as spiritualists have been at times easily deceived, and so much fraud and charlatanism have been connected with professional mediums who claimed to have access to the spirit world, that it is difficult to interest thinking people in the real facts, and the whole matter is dismissed as fraudulent. Certainly no charge of weakmindedness can be successfully made against such men as Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir William Crookes, Lord Kelvin, Professor W. F. Barratt, William T. Stead, Professor W. James, F. W. H. Myers, Alfred Russell Wallace, Dr. Charles Richet, Camille Flammarion, William Marconi, and Cesare Lombroso. It would be difficult to make a duplicate list of such eminent scientists. Yet practically every one of these men began the study of this subject prejudiced against spiritism, and in some cases in order to expose the fraud, and concluded by accepting the spiritistic hypothesis. It can also be said that no society or group of men has been so vigilant as far as evidence is concerned, or so successful in exposing fraud as has the Society for Psychical Research.

There are two or three things which the investigators in psychical research have recognized but which have not always been considered by their critics. In the first place, spiritism is neither based upon, nor proved by, physical phenomena. Tables may tip, heavy objects may be moved, trumpets may blow, hands may be tied, and tambourines may rattle, but this has absolutely nothing to do with the proof of continued existence. Many spiritualists and professional mediums exhibit these things as their total stock in trade and claim that only spirits could perform these feats. The society's members examine these cases most minutely but do not present the facts as a proof of spirits, to say nothing of immortality. The American Society recently published a detailed

report of such a case (which case I had the privilege of investigating on two different occasions), covering 672 pages, under the caption of *A Case of Hysteria*. Most of the fraud is connected with physical phenomena.

The society also recognizes that the physicists' and chemists' claims of a new discovery are easily tested, as conditions necessary for similar experiments are readily duplicated. It is not so with the discoveries of psychical research. The facts are casual and complicated, for the Society only investigates the unusual. When the chemist says, "Show me," the psychical researcher answers, "I cannot show you now, and I do not know that I ever can." Then the chemist smiles knowingly and turns away.

The objection of the materialistic biologist to spiritism is deeper. He "regards consciousness as an epiphenomenon, the product of a particular collocation of highly organized matter in the brain, a product which vanishes when the collocation is destroyed." Consciousness is like the "epiphyte which draws its nourishment from the plant upon which it grows, and perishes when its support dies." The theory upon which this objection rests has been disposed of by Professor James in his Ingersoll lecture on "Immortality." He says that if "thought is a function of the brain," it must be considered that a function may be either productive or permissive or transmissive, and he classes the function of the brain as either of the last two, like the glass in the window which does not produce the light but transmits it; the removal of the glass entirely does not destroy the light but gives it free access. Any proved case of continued existence after death would cause the biologist to change his theory.

The two great discoverers of the evolution theory, Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace, differed in their theories concerning the mental and spiritual part of man's nature. Darwin believed that the soul was derived from the lower animals, and that the spiritual nature was but a by-product developed by the struggle for existence. To this Wallace disagreed, asserting that the Darwinian conception of the origin of the soul precluded immortality. Here again we are concerned with the theory of origin, for, if proof of the continued existence after death is once made, the theory of origin will of necessity coincide.

Various Theories and Arguments

Those who have been interested in psychical research have admitted that personality may not survive as it exists here, and in fact opine that the conditions are very different, but seem to have no definite conception of these conditions. It is on account of these conditions, they say, that communication is so difficult to establish. The conditions are such that only certain peculiar persons are able to receive these communications and only then in an abnormal state. If the same thing is true among the spirits, it is no wonder, they think, that messages are so simple and at times so muddled. The emphasis, so far, has been laid upon proving the identity of the pretended spirit, and to most persons the questions asked to establish this identity have been trifling; but Professor Hyslop thinks he has proved by experiments between two persons at the ends of a telephone wire, that to estab-

lish identity the most trivial incidents are the most valuable. This is the answer given to the criticism of the triviality of the messages.

Those conducting psychical research realize that the proof of the existence of spirits does not prove that these spirits ever lived as human beings on earth, and that the continued existence of persons beyond the grave does not necessarily confer immortality upon these persons nor confirm immortality as the destiny of the race. At most they hope to prove that the mind can exist without the material basis such as we know here, and that the communicating intelligence from the spirit world is that of an individual who once lived on earth. The former, of course, does not include the latter.

As in all branches of science, we find experts disagreeing regarding the interpretation of the facts, while acknowledging the facts themselves. The most serious difference of theory is between those who posit a direct message from the spirits and those who explain the facts by a very broad telepathy—telepathy *à trois*. The latter say that a person may receive a message from another and unknown person through the medium of a third person, the last-named being even unconscious of the message transferred. If this were carried out indefinitely, it would be difficult to prove anything in the psychic realm. To most people this broad telepathic hypothesis is even more difficult to accept than the spiritistic. However, we can afford to allow the specialists to wage this battle among themselves and to wait for the ultimate conclusion.

Considering the general ignorance and misunderstanding of the work of those engaged in psychical research, it has seemed necessary to state the position and aims of the Society before endeavoring to answer the questions which we have asked ourselves. Of the difficulties of the work I have said nothing. While all research work is difficult, the obstacles surrounding psychical research seem at times to be insuperable; those brave enough to attempt it and persistent enough to continue it deserve all credit and sympathy. We may at least say that in an age when science held a grip on knowledge and authority, and when the trend of this science was strongly materialistic, this society insisted on an equal chance for a spiritualistic interpretation and called our attention to a vital idealism.

The Proper Attitude toward Psychical Research

Having but lifted the curtain sufficiently to get a glimpse of the work which these students are attempting, we may listen for a moment to Sir Oliver Lodge's appeal:

> Science might not be able to reveal human destiny, but it certainly should not obscure it. . . . . I am one of those who think the methods of science can be applied to the psychic region. Allow us, anyhow, to make the attempt. Let those who prefer the materialistic hypothesis by all means develop their thesis as far as they can, but let us also try what we can do in the psychic region, and see who wins.

That sounds fair, and seems like good advice for the churches. The church believes in immortality. Why should it object to having it proved? Have we not passed the time when we should object to knowledge in order to make

room for faith? The churches should show the same respect for psychical research as they do for all other kinds, viz., patient waiting for the conclusion of the experts, and then acceptance of the results. When it was announced that Madame Curie had discovered radium and that this new and strange substance threatened to upset certain laws of physics concerning energy which were supposed to be like the laws of the Medes and Persians, the church (and every sensible person) simply accepted the opinions of experts. Recognizing the impossibility of duplicating the experiments on account of unfamiliarity with the laws of physics and lack of skill in such matters, we trusted the honesty of the experts which we had no reason to doubt. The experiments in psychical research are, if anything, more difficult to perform and the laws as little understood. The evidence is too voluminous and technical for the layman, although it may be accessible, and the extracts are often misleading. We must treat psychical research as we do all research, and if we take expert opinions of other kinds seriously, why not treat those of psychical research seriously?

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON
Principal of the University of Chicago High School

In the January number of the BIBLICAL WORLD *Professor Johnson contributed the general introduction to his "Course of Ethics for Boys in Sunday School." With the present number Professor Johnson begins the publication of definite studies. Each one of these studies is intended for a single class meeting. It is hoped that they will be of great help to all teachers of boys of high-school age.*

Study I. Two Views of Boyhood

There are two views of boyhood. The one most commonly held and that about which the boy hears most from his elders is that it is a period of preparation. All its various activities are viewed from the standpoint of their value as preparation for the life which he is to live as a man. In most respects this seems to be a wholesome attitude and will readily be accepted by the boy himself.

It will be worth while to apply this view in some specific cases.

There are many boys' schools which are called "preparatory schools." In what sense is the term "preparatory"

thus used? Does the high school in your community prepare boys for such a trade as carpentry? for farming? How would you justify the study of Latin as preparation for life? history?

What is the value of athletics as preparation? Would not working in the garden be as valuable exercise as football? Of what value is the game to the boy in the "bleachers"? Is ability to play athletic games of value to a man? What school-boy games are adapted to mature manhood? What suggestion does this offer as to the relative value of different athletic games?

What does the home contribute to the boy's preparation for life? the Sunday school?

There are many harmful agencies which have to do with the preparation of a boy for manhood. Mention some of these which are found among the boys in your community.

The other view of boyhood is that it is not merely preparation for life, but life itself. From this standpoint the activities of boy life have real value in themselves and make similar demands upon his physical, intellectual, and moral forces to those which he will encounter in mature life. Honorable success in the work and play of boyhood has real and present satisfaction, valuable in itself; failure brings a corresponding sense of present loss. To the boy himself, this sense of present value is probably a more powerful factor in determining his conduct than any consideration of the remote future consequences. For example, the high-school athlete gives up smoking during the football season in order that he may be in better condition for the games, but he is not deterred from resuming the habit after the last game by fear that his physical strength may suffer any permanent loss.

From the standpoint of present satisfaction, what would cause you to choose between lying and telling the truth? to train for the football eleven? to prepare your mathematics assignment for tomorrow?

In many cases these two considerations, preparation for the future, and present satisfaction, are at the same time influential in determining a boy's conduct. Mention some situation in which this is the case. But this does not always seem to hold; give an illustration. Is the relative value of these appeals the same with every boy in a given case? Which seems to have most to do with your conduct from day to day?

Not long ago preachers were accustomed to appeal to their hearers on the basis of the future consequences of their acts. When our fathers were boys, they were urged to be good in order that after they were dead they might enjoy heaven or escape hell. Preachers now have much less to say about the hereafter, and are telling us how we may secure happiness now in the service of those about us. With this new emphasis, boyhood takes on new value. So long as the boy thinks of his life merely as preparation for manhood's tasks, he is often willing to let things go and take a chance of supplying what is lacking later on. But if the boy can see that today's work and play present occasions for the exercise of a boy's judgment, the testing of a boy's character, the outlay of a boy's strength, just as important and as difficult for him now as those which

will come to him in his mature manhood, life will take on for him more meaning and zest. By all means let the boy think of the importance of preparing himself for manhood's tasks by the proper training of his body, mind, and character, but let him see also that his daily activities have real value for him and that he should be able to justify his conduct on the ground of the present satisfaction that it brings him.

Study II. Some Elemental Problems

At about the age of fourteen begins the period in a boy's life known as adolescence. This period is marked by certain physiological changes in his body which are accompanied by other great and important changes in his habit of thought and of conduct. It is the period of rapid physical growth, often accompanied by a feeling of awkwardness and diffidence. He begins to think for himself and to question the authority of his parents and others whose control he has up to this time accepted naturally. He often feels himself misunderstood and sometimes abused. Boys at this period crave freedom and adventure and to secure it often break away from the restraints of school or home. It is the age of truancy from school, of "running away" from home. It is a period of the most violent change which takes place in his entire life. He has been a child but is one no longer; he is not yet a man but is rapidly becoming one. He is like one adrift in a boat broken loose from its moorings, driven violently by wind and wave, with the pilot overboard. He must ride out the storm and learn to steer for himself. It is a time of great peril but of glorious possibilities.

Discuss as illustrations the large number of boys who leave school at fourteen to go to work; the rapid falling-off of the attendance upon Sunday school at this age; the formation of gangs to play Indian or pirate, sometimes for vicious or criminal practices; the comparative advantages of the city and country for boys at this period.

Boyhood is the period when life-habits are formed. The problem of boyhood is one of adjustment from the control of others to control of himself. He will better make the transition if he realizes what some of the specific problems are. These will be made the subjects of later chapters and will then be treated in detail. Let us briefly sketch some of the more important here.

The Problem of Keeping Clean

1. *In body.*—The changes which take place in the boy's body at this time are most important and fundamental. These are not alarming in themselves, but quite natural. The boy is sure to receive suggestions from associates of his own age or from ignorant or vicious older persons, which are full of peril. His physical and moral health depend upon his resisting temptations to defile his body. Let him remember that if properly controlled and directed, his sexual powers are a treasure of great strength in his life; misdirected they may become a source of infinite peril and disaster.

2. *In mind.*—The mind is like the sensitive plate of the photographer. In boyhood it is extremely sensitive to improper suggestions. Let him realize that, while he will not be able to keep his mind free from thoughts that he knows are improper, he can keep from dwelling on these thoughts. If he is to be a self-controlled man, of clean life, he must fight out for himself this control of his inner thoughts.

3. *In speech.*—The boy who keeps his mind clean will be clean of speech. "Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh." "Smutty" talk is very common among boys and is most pernicious in its results. The self-respecting boy will not defile himself in this way.

Suggestions for discussion: The importance of selecting clean companions. The value and danger of athletics in relation to clean living.

The Problem of Keeping "Square"

In business and politics there are frequent disclosures of dishonesty or "graft." The boy is sure to find himself confronted with suggestions, either from within or from without, to indulge in dishonest practices. In school life there is much petty evasion as well as down-right dishonesty in athletics and in the routine of school life. In the home life there is abundant opportunity for dishonesty. In the case of boys in the office or the shop there are many chances for dishonesty. The boy, whether in the school, the home, or the shop, is sure to see those who are not "on the square." It is easy thoughtlessly to fall into the ways of others. No boy should allow himself to fall into dishonest practices through imitation. The man of whom it can be said "his word is as good as his bond" is sure to be in demand. The boy who is always "on the square" has the respect of others and of himself.

Suggestions for discussion: Different standards of honesty in dealing with one's fellows and with teacher or employer. The code of honor between rival schools.

Study III. Custom

Custom is responsible for much of our conduct. In different communities and countries, the styles of clothing, types of houses, articles of food and method of their preparation, education, religion, games, and social customs differ widely. The native dress and manners of the Oriental seem strange to the American boy; ours seem no less so to the Chinese boy. A short time often marks great changes in custom. A photograph or magazine illustration of a few years ago shows people in clothing that looks ridiculous, though at the time it was the prevailing style. Who decides whether we shall wear our trousers turned up this season or whether our vests shall be cut high or low? What are the advantages and disadvantages resulting from uniformity in styles of clothing? Why should these change from year to year?

In religion and politics most people follow the custom of those with whom they are intimately associated. In England most people are Protestants; in

Italy, Roman Catholics. Most Methodists are reared in Methodist families, Congregationalists in Congregational families, etc. Why is this? The son is likely to ally himself with his father's political party. In the South, most white men vote the Democratic ticket. There is of late a marked tendency, particularly among young men, to break away from these restraints of custom in politics. What cause can be assigned for this? Is this tendency advantageous to society?

There are many customs that have grown up in social life to which most people conform, e.g., the proper use of the knife and fork in eating, the removal of the hat by men in the house or when saluting a woman or another man to whom it is desired to show respect. Certain forms of expression are customary in letter-writing, such as "Dear Sir," and "Yours very truly" or some similar form at the close. Some business houses are doing away with these expressions in their correspondence.

As far as these social customs are an expression of genuine courtesy, they tend to make the ordinary intercourse of life more agreeable and are to be valued highly. No one, however, should make the mistake of thinking that these can take the place of real nobility of character. An immoral man may possess all the external graces commonly spoken of as "good manners." May a man of good character have "bad manners"? Should one ever violate social custom? If so, under what circumstances, and why?

Customs often develop in a community or group like a school or club which exert a strong influence upon its members. These often persist through years and are then spoken of as traditions. These may be either good or bad, and often in themselves may be neither. Sometimes in school or college, certain colors or articles of clothing are required of one class, while others are forbidden. One of the Yale fences may be sat upon only by Seniors. Some high schools observe "rough-neck day." What is the basis of these customs? Have you any such in your school? What purpose do they serve? In some schools a low or medium grade is regarded as a "gentleman's grade," with the result that good scholarship becomes socially unpopular. Some schools have traditions of good sportsmanship so strong and high that no one would think of taking an unfair advantage of an opponent. What good traditions and what bad ones have you in your school? What should be your attitude toward these? Are you under any obligation to help continue a bad custom, however long it may have been carried out?

In the life of Jesus, we find valuable suggestions for our own conduct. Such customs as were good he followed. For example, read Luke 4:16: "As his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day." Evil customs he sternly rebuked. Read the story of his treatment of the money changers and sellers of animals for sacrifice in the temple (John 2:14–16). Why was this custom wrong? How did Jesus' teaching about the observance of the Sabbath differ from the custom of his times? Read Matt. 12:1–13. Discuss the question of Sunday conduct in the light of Jesus' teaching and conduct.

Study IV. Habit

Habit is an even more important factor than custom in determining our actions. If every morning we had to give conscious attention to the buttoning of our clothing and to the other details connected with dressing, to our steps as we walk down stairs, to the movements involved in eating, and so on through the day to every one of the thousands of separate actions which we perform, life would be a dreary and endless routine of petty acts. Happily we are so made that an act frequently repeated learns to perform itself without our conscious direction. We learn from psychology that impressions received through any of our sense organs are transmitted to the brain through one set of nerves and through another set of nerves the brain sends back directions for the appropriate act. For example, the child places his finger on a hot stove, the sensation of pain is transmitted to the brain, the order is hurried back to the muscles of the arm, and the hand is removed. All our conscious acts originate in this way. But after an act has been many times repeated, the currents to and from the brain seem to have worn a channel through which they tend to flow, and the action follows the sensation without any conscious act of the will. Thus, when we get up in the morning we go through the many movements involved in dressing in order, without paying any attention to them. Some of our most common habits are very complicated. Discuss the various elements involved in walking, in playing the piano, in batting a ball or catching a fly in the out-field.

We can easily see that habit plays a very important part in saving time and energy which we should otherwise devote to a dull and monotonous routine for more interesting and important uses. Professor James says that ninety-nine hundredths or possibly nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of our activity is purely automatic and habitual. Our success, then, depends very largely on the habits which we form.

Youth is pre-eminently the time when habits are formed. When we speak of habits we usually use the term in a moral sense and have in mind bad habits, e.g., the smoking-habit or the drinking-habit. But there are also good habits, e.g., the habit of truth-telling, of abstaining from drinking or smoking. Both good and bad habits are formed in the same way. It is important that we form, as early in life as possible, as many useful habits as we can. Professor James gives four excellent maxims for forming habits:

1. "*Launch yourself with as strong and decided an initiative as possible.*" This might take different forms in different cases, e.g., telling one's chum or club that you are going to form a certain good habit or give up some bad habit. Professor James cites the case of a man who offered through a newspaper advertisement a reward to anyone who should find him in a certain saloon to which he had been accustomed to go. How would this help the man to break the drinking-habit? What would be the advantage of taking a public pledge?

2. "*Never suffer an exception to occur till the new habit is securely rooted in your life.*" Professor Bain says: "The peculiarity of the moral habits is the

presence of two hostile powers, one to be gradually raised into the ascendent over the other. It is necessary above all things, in such a situation, never to lose a battle."

3. "*Seize the very first possible opportunity to act on every resolution you make and on every emotional prompting you may experience in the direction of the habits you aspire to gain.*" When you have decided that you will form a good habit or break a bad one, don't put off action, but begin at once. "Hell is paved with good intentions."

4. "*Keep the faculty of effort alive in you by a little gratuitous exercise every day.*" "That is, be systematically heroic in little unnecessary points, do every day or two something for no other reason than its difficulty so that when the hour of dire need draws nigh, it may find you are not unnerved and untrained to stand the test." I recall hearing a famous university football coach tell a group of high-school boys that he made it a practice occasionally to give up drinking coffee of which he was fond, not because he thought it harmful but that he might have this valuable practice in self-denial. In what other ways might you apply this in your own case?

Suggestions for further study: What are some of the bad habits to which the boys of your town, or school are addicted? What are some of the habits which you could acquire to advantage?

MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL

III. THE GOD OF THE CHRISTIAN

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.
Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary
Author of "Christian Theology in Outline"

In the last article we considered the first of the three great questions of religion, the question of the source of religious faith, or the seat of authority in religion. We asked ourselves why we need a Bible, and we found that we need it for two reasons. In the first place, we need it as a source of religious inspiration and instruction for the individual soul; and in the second place, as a standard of faith and practice for the church. We asked ourselves how the older view of the Bible met this double need, and we saw that it met it by providing an infallible book, inerrant in all its parts, equally trustworthy in its history, its chronology, its science, and its religion, equally adapted, therefore, in all its parts to be used as a standard of faith and life. We saw further that in the practical application of this method difficulties were encountered. There were

apparent inconsistencies in the teaching of the different parts of the Bible. What it had to say concerning God and man and sin and salvation was differently understood by different people, and the problem of reconciling these differences was a formidable one. In theory each man was free to interpret the Bible for himself, but in practice a more definite principle was necessary. So the tradition and creed of the church was added to the Bible as the practical standard by which men's faith and life were judged.

Now, if all men had been members of one church this method would have worked well enough, but as a matter of fact they were not. There were different churches differing in creed and in tradition, each appealing to the same Bible in justification of their claim. Who is to judge when doctors disagree?

Here modern theology comes to our aid, for it gives us a point of view which enables us to understand these differences and to see how they may be made helps rather than hindrances. In the first place, it calls attention to the human element in the Bible. It shows us that it is a composite book consisting of very different materials brought together by men of different degrees of maturity and of insight through a long period of time. As a result of this it shows us, in the second place, that not all parts of the Bible stand on the same spiritual level. The Bible is the record of a progressive revelation in which God has been using the means which lay nearest at hand to train mankind for his full and complete revelation in Jesus Christ.

Now, this view of the Bible is helpful to us in two ways. It is helpful, in the first place, because it brings out more clearly than the older view the variety of contents in the Bible, and its fitness to minister to very different needs. The Bible, we must always remember, was given, not simply for men of the twentieth century, but for men of the first as well, and it had to be written, therefore, in language which could be understood by those to whom it came. And we today, ministering as we do to men of different grades of spiritual experience and culture, find this variety of content in the Bible of immense practical help in our work as preachers.

But in the second place and more important, modern theology points out the supreme importance of Jesus Christ as the unifying element in the Bible and as the standard by which all its teaching must be tested. It shows us how the earlier parts of the Bible are to be understood as the steps by which God has been preparing the way for him, and the later portions as the first fruits of the new spirit of liberty which he had promised to his church. So it recovers for spiritual uses and spiritual authority parts of the Bible which apart from this key would be full of difficulty, and justifies the historic judgment of the church that it is an inspired, that is, an authoritative, book.

But the Bible, after all, is only the beginning of religion. It is the book to which we go to find out what we ought to believe. Today I want to consider more in detail what it is that the Bible gives us. From the source of faith we pass to its content.

The answer can be given in a single word. The object of faith is God. God is the subject of the Bible from

Genesis to Revelation, and every question of practical religion with which it deals has its roots finally in the view which is taken of him. It is no minor or unimportant subject, therefore, which is to engage our attention, but one which brings us into the very heart and inner shrine of religion. The oldest and yet the newest, the most profound but the most practical, the most exhaustless, yet the most necessary of all the subjects to which the mind of man can be directed, or with which the heart of man can be concerned, is God.

The method which I propose to follow in the present discussion is the same which has already proved helpful in our treatment of our former subject. I shall ask, in the first place, why we need God at all. In the second place, I shall ask how the theologians of the past thought of God as meeting this need. In the third place, I shall ask what contribution modern theology has to make to our idea of God. And finally, I shall ask what effect we may expect this contribution to have upon the religious life.

Why, then, do we need God? We have never seen him, we have never heard him, we have never touched him. There are wise men who have questioned whether he exists at all, or if he exists, whether we can know anything definite about him. Yet in every age men have gone on believing in God, and the belief has powerfully affected their conduct. What is the explanation of this fact? What need, I repeat, is satisfied by faith in God?

I answer, we need God for two reasons. In the first place, we need him in order that we may have something to worship, and in the second place, we need him in order that we may have someone to give us help.

You will notice that I have put the need of worship first. That is not the order which is most familiar, at least in our non-liturgical churches. Worship holds a subordinate place in our scheme of religion. We make place for it, to be sure; we have our hymns and our prayer, but in our estimate of values these hold a subordinate place. We speak of them often (even those of us who are ministers) as the preliminary exercises. Our attention is concentrated upon the sermon as the central feature in the morning's service. We claim to be practical men, and we commend religion because of what it can do for us. It is the helpfulness of God which gives him his chief value in our eyes.

But more careful reflection will convince us that this is a superficial view. The greatest thing that God can do for any of us is simply to be himself. More than any specific thing which he can do *for us* is that which he is *to us*. We need God, I repeat, most of all in order that we may have something to worship, and by that I mean something to look up to, something of which we can feel that it is higher, more powerful, more resourceful, more inspiring, more satisfying and ennobling than we. To have a God is to have an ideal and to know that, however far I may fall below my own standard, or my neighbor may fall below his, or all men together may fall below theirs, still somewhere and somehow the ideal is realized and the supreme values that make life worth living will be conserved.

This need of someone greater to look

up to and to adore is a universal need. Wherever we look we find that it is present. I have spoken of the witness of modern science to the universality of religion. It is just at this point that the evidence of this universality is most convincing. The difference between man and the animals is found in the fact that man alone has ideals, and the religious nature of man consists in the fact that in his heart of hearts he is persuaded that that which for him is ideal is also in some true sense real.

But though all men thus believe in God there is a great difference in the kind of God in whom men believe. Some men find power the most admirable thing. The ability to do as one pleases, to carry one's purposes to execution in spite of every opposition, to execute vengeance upon one's enemies, to have one's own will at any cost—this it is which seems to many men most satisfying, and it is this quality which calls forth their wonder, and their admiration in God.

And there are others to whom mystery seems the most divine thing; they love to feel themselves in the presence of some inscrutable being, so far surpassing man's capacity to comprehend or understand that his boldest thought turns back baffled from the quest, as the rays of a lantern lose themselves in the encircling fog. This sense of boundlessness, of infinitude, of deeps unfathomed, seems to many most wonderful and adorable, and it is the fact that God is such a being which commands their worship.

And to still others righteousness expresses their highest thought of God. God is the being in whom the moral ideal after which we vainly strive here on earth is perfectly realized. God is justice personified, the mind that sees all things in their right relations, and the will that decides unvaryingly according to what he sees.

And to still others, finally, it is unselfishness which seems the most divine thing in the world. God is love, the embodiment and the supreme expression of that passion of self-devotion of which we gain faint gleams in the love of the mother for the child, or the sacrifice of the patriot for his country.

It is not enough, then, to speak of God in the abstract. We must go on to define the kind of God in whom we believe. We are interested here in the Christian conception of God, and we wish to know what there is in this conception which calls forth our worship.

But worship is only one side of religion. We need God not only that we may have someone to look up to, but that there may be someone to reach down to us as helper and friend. This too is a need of universal range. Wherever we go we find men conscious of a lack which man cannot supply. They need guidance, for there are questions which they cannot answer. They need salvation, for there are evils from which they cannot escape. Above all, they need power, for their vitality is constantly drained and must be constantly renewed if they are to meet the responsibilities and bear the burdens that each new day brings, and for this in every age men have turned to that unseen source of supply which we call God.

But here again this common need is consistent with infinite variety of detail. Faith in God has been found

among men in every stage of moral and spiritual experience. The kings of Israel cried to God for help against their enemies, for victory in battle against the Canaanite and the Assyrian. Hezekiah turned to God for the healing of his sickness, and in this he is typical of a great company of men in every age down to the last convert to Christian Science. For others it is forgiveness of sins that is the great need, some assurance that the burden of guilt from which they try in vain to escape will be lifted off and they be restored to self-respect and enabled to begin a new life of freedom and peace. Or again, it may be power for service that is desired, strength for the unceasing struggle to help men who do not want to be helped, and faith to believe that the struggle will in the end succeed.

How, then, have Christians thought of God as meeting this double need, the need of an object of worship, and the need of a source of help? What was there in God as Christ had revealed him which satisfied men's need for a realized ideal, and in what ways did the Supreme reach down to make his power practically helpful in daily life?

If we turn to the older devotional literature we find that there were three ways in which God was pictured as satisfying man's need of worship. In the first place he satisfied it through his majesty. God was a sovereign, holding all things in the hollow of his hand, ordering all things by the decree of his will. In the second place, God was righteous. Justice was of the very essence of his being, so inwrought into his nature that he could not do wrong if he would. Finally, God was loving. Righteous as he was, uncompromising in his opposition to evil, terrible in his judgments upon sin, he was yet gracious, tender, ready to forgive those whom he had chosen for himself. So in God all the deepest needs of man's nature found their answer and satisfaction. And man could be sure that whatever changes the years might bring, the object of his adoration would never prove less adorable.

And as God furnished man with a satisfying object of worship, so also he was an ever-present source of help. There was no need felt by man for which he had not made full provision. He met the need of guidance. In the Bible he had given a clear revelation of his will and told man in plain words what he was to believe and what he was to do. He met the need of salvation. Through the atonement he had made full provision for the guilt of sin and made possible free forgiveness to all who would lay hold upon it by faith. And above and beyond all this he was present in the world by his Spirit ministering to the needs of his elect in countless ways, calling into existence a new spiritual life in regeneration, interpreting the Bible to them by the witness of his Spirit, sanctifying them more and more by the renewal of his grace, assuring them of their calling as sons of God, feeding their souls by the means of grace which he had provided in Word and sacraments, and so preparing them at last for their final destiny as children of God in the new life of his kingdom.

Here certainly are great blessings. A religion which could do this for men is not to be despised, and those of us who have been brought up under the old theology and know men and women

whose lives have been nourished by the faith it fostered will never be able to speak of its teachings in any other language than that of reverence and tenderness.

But there is another side to the picture which honesty will not suffer us altogether to overlook. These great blessings were bought at a great price. It was the price of God's universal fatherhood. Between God and man there was a barrier of distance which rendered impossible for men in general that free access to the heavenly Father which is characteristic of the life of children with their parents.

This barrier was twofold. It was in part intellectual and in part moral. Man was separated from God by his ignorance, and he was separated by his sin. What God was like, no man could know except by supernatural revelation, and this revelation, theoretically open to all in the Bible, was in fact restricted to those to whom God was pleased to grant the witness of his Spirit. To those to whom he had revealed himself through this witness God was indeed a gracious Father, loving and tender, but for the rest of mankind he remained the unknown God, or, if known at all, known only as the author of a law which man was helpless to obey and which therefore held in store only nameless terrors. Even to those who had received the divine revelation, the doctrines of the faith remained mysteries into which the mind of man could not penetrate. One must believe indeed that God was three in one, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but how this could be, one could not hope to understand, nor indeed did one need to do so.

But formidable as was the obstacle for the mind, the barrier for the conscience was more insurmountable still. Man was separated from God by his sin. God was just, and justice was thought of not as we think of it today, as the means which the all-wise and all-loving Father takes to accomplish the moral training of his children. Justice was an independent principle, inherent in the divine nature—a principle which not only expressed his opposition to sin, but also his separation from the sinner. Justice was that in God which bound him to punish every least infraction of his law with infinite doom—a doom which no penitence of man could avert, even were perfect penitence in his power. Justice, therefore, so far from being a bond which united man and God, was a barrier keeping them forever apart unless some method could be found by which God could pass over.

Such a method was, to be sure, provided by God's grace. Through the atonement of Jesus Christ a way was found to blot out the guilt of sin and to make possible the free forgiveness of the sinner. But even here the gain was won at a heavy cost. For as a result of the conception of justice to which I have already referred, the conception of love itself was perverted. It was no longer an imperious necessity inwrought into the very nature of God, defining the attitude of the Father toward every one of his children; it was an expression of the principle of sovereignty, the power of arbitrary choice. God was one who had mercy on whom he would have mercy, but who hardened whom he would. As the atonement of Christ was necessary if forgiveness was to be

possible, so the divine decree decided for whom this provision should avail. The rest remained in the outer darkness, from which there was no possibility of deliverance.

Now, I am well aware that what I have been saying will seem to many an exaggeration if not a travesty. I know very well that many ministers who hold what they call the old theology have preached a far larger and more generous gospel. I gladly recognize that the presence of God in all human life, the justice of God as an element through which he trains his children, the love of God as the expression of his inmost heart, the deepest and the most profound of all the truths of Christianity: I gladly recognize, I say, that these great convictions are the monopoly of no single age or school of theologians. In every age men who have studied their Bible and been brought into contact through it with the heart of Jesus Christ have laid hold upon the central truths of the gospel and brought them home with power to the lives of men. My point is simply that it was more difficult to do this a generation ago than it is today. There were obstacles in the way of believing in God's universal fatherhood which those who have been trained in the methods of modern science do not feel. The barrier of distance which separated God from his human child has been removed, and so the way opened for that intimate and satisfying conception of God which is the supreme gift of Christianity to mankind.

By this I do not mean simply that modern theology has emphasized the divine immanence. That is true, but irrelevant. We twentieth-century Christians have no monopoly of the doctrine of immanence. Calvin, too, believed that God was everywhere present in his world, and that nothing was independent of his control; yet none the less God seemed to Calvin infinitely remote from multitudes of his creatures. The nearness which I have in mind is not of essence, but of character. It shows itself in feeling even more than in action. I mean that there is nothing in God's nature which separates him from any child of man. I mean that God understands man and sympathizes with him and longs to do him good. There is no individual, and there is no class of men for whom God does not care, and whom he does not wish to draw into filial relations with himself.

There are two ways in which the scientific habit has helped to bring God near. It has brought him near to the mind. There is a sense indeed in which the result of modern science has been to render us more than ever conscious of our littleness and insignificance. As we have come to understand better the vastness of the universe and the intricacy of its mechanism, we have gained a new impression of the greatness and of the wisdom of the being who is its cause. But in another sense, the effect has been just the reverse. Modern science has increased our faith in the intelligibility of the universe, and in the trustworthiness of our own faculties as a guide to truth. We have learned that when we approach the world in the spirit of faith and reverence, it yields to our advances; that when we treat it as if it were a rational world, it lends itself to rational interpretation, and how shall we account

for this, if not through the presence in and through nature of a rational cause, a being, in a true sense, like ourselves?

The presence of this common spiritual element, uniting God and man, makes possible the incarnation. The incarnation is the self-revelation of God in man. We believe that through Christ God has shown us what he himself is like, and has given us an insight into his character and purpose, which is an adequate guide for the interpretation of his Word. And he could do this because of the inner bond of which I have spoken, for if God were a being wholly unlike mankind, it would not have been possible for him to have revealed himself to man through man.

But what is more important still, modern theology has brought God near to the heart. It has removed the element of arbitrariness which has lingered so long in our thought of him. God, as we have come to believe in him today, is a consistent God. He acts according to law. That is to say, he has a uniform method, rooted in principles as unchanging as himself. He is not a being who has favorites, or who makes exceptions. He does not act according to one principle at one time, and according to another principle at another time. He does not deal with some men in terms of justice and with others in terms of love. All that he does is directed to a single end, namely, the establishment of the kingdom of God which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

This does not mean that modern theology lays less emphasis upon the justice of God than the theology of the past, but only that it conceives it in a different way. Justice is that quality in God which expresses his inherent love of righteousness as it appears in his dealings with individual men. It is manifest in his opposition to sin as long as sin continues, but it is shown no less clearly in his forgiveness of sin when true repentance makes forgiveness possible. It makes use of punishment indeed—a punishment as inexorable as sin, and as terrible, but punishment is never an end in itself. It is the means which love uses to accomplish its supreme end—the salvation of men, and their union, one with another and with God, in the righteous life of the kingdom.

So, in many ways, modern theology has helped to clarify and purify our conception of God. It retains all that is inspiring and satisfying in the older view, while avoiding the difficulties to which it was exposed. It offers us an object of worship august and wonderful enough to satisfy every demand of the emotional nature. Is it a question of majesty? What could be more majestic than God as we apprehend him today? God is the infinite Spirit, who informs and inhabits the universe—life of its life, light of its light, directing all things according to the counsel of his will, to the far-off divine event which he has planned as the goal of all conscious life. Is it a question of righteousness? God is righteous, and the exactor of righteousness in others. He has set a standard to which he requires that all men and all nations shall conform, and that standard is the character of Christ. But above all, God is loving—loving even as Christ is loving, loving by the inner necessity of his nature, and willingly paying through all eternity the

cost that true love always exacts of the lover. What can heart desire which such a God cannot supply? Still we can sing with Watts:

Our God, our help in ages past;
Our hope in years to come
Our refuge from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.

or with Bowring:

When I survey the wondrous cross
On which the Prince of Glory died,
My richest gain I count but loss,
And pour contempt on all my pride.

Now it is clear that if we have such a God as this he ought to mean more in our lives than ever before. We ought to be looking up to him more constantly, counting upon him more certainly, turning to him in every crisis of our lives for the help that we need.

But is this really true? Is it a fact that God means more in our life today than he meant in the life of our fathers? Do we turn to him more constantly for help? Are we as conscious of his presence as the outstanding factor in our lives?

I am afraid that if we were to give a truthful answer to this question it would have to be in the negative. One of the noticeable features of our day is the decline of personal religion in the old sense of the term, the loss of that sense of personal intimacy between God and his child which was so characteristic a feature of the older religion. We talk a great deal about God; we think about him not a little, but we do not feel him as real and as near, as Luther did or Wesley, not to speak of Isaiah or St. Paul.

Here is a situation which demands our most serious consideration. Those who base their teaching upon external authority may insist that they are right, however much their doctrines may seem to contradict experience; but a theology which makes practice the test of truth must stand or fall by its fruits in life. Unless the new thought of God issues in a richer experience of God it is self-condemned.

I have been trying as best I could to discover the reason for the decline of personal religion. In part, no doubt, it is a result of the increased pressure of life. Activity is the characteristic note of the modern world. Almost every day a new society is formed to render some new service or to meet some new need. On every side we hear the complaint that people are so busy they have no time to stop and think. The quiet hours that parents used to spend with their children, the time sacredly reserved for family worship, or for the reading of the Bible Sunday afternoon is crowded out by other duties which seem more pressing.

And it is not simply that we have found so much to do, but we have found so much that we are able to do. This new social and philanthropic activity has justified itself by its fruits. We have discovered that many of the evils which we once thought irremediable are capable of cure, if only we set our hands to the task. And there is nothing which appeals to a normal man or woman like work that is effective for an object that is worth while. So the very success of our practical efforts at helpfulness has, for the time, turned our thoughts away from those deeper needs which in every

age have driven men to God and kept alive in human hearts the flame of personal religion.

But after all, the real reason for the decline of which I have been speaking lies deeper. You cannot seriously give yourself to the task of trying to help your fellow-man without, sooner or later, realizing your limitations. For a time you may be content to deal with the ills that lie on the surface, to better housing conditions, to foster habits of saving, to provide opportunities of healthful amusement and the like, but presently you find that these things go only a little way. There are deeper needs which cannot thus be met—needs of inward renewal, of the transformation of character, of deliverance from selfishness and pettiness and the tyranny of habit; the need of inner contentment and peace, of a larger outlook, of a more satisfying ambition. And when we try to meet these deeper needs we soon discover how limited our resources are, and are driven back for help to God, like all those who have attempted the same tasks before us.

And this brings me to a second reason for the decline of which I have spoken, one far more fundamental and far-reaching. It is not simply that we have been too busy to seek help in God, but that we have not been sure that God could give us the help we needed, even if we were to ask him.

For what is it that we need of God? It is such help as a man would give his fellow-man, help direct, individual, personal, differing from moment to moment, from hour to hour, according to our differing needs. That is the kind of help for which our fathers turned to God and which they were conscious of receiving from him. If he was apart from the world, transcendent, as we call it in our theological speech, it was only that he might be able the better to express his individuality and to exercise his freedom. I have spoken of the gulf that yawned between God and his creature, but it was a gulf which God could cross at any moment if he would, and which, as a matter of fact, he was constantly crossing. All that was necessary to do was to cry to God in prayer, and one could be sure that the needed help would be forthcoming.

But with the world which modern science reveals it is different. God is a God of law, that is to say, he acts everywhere and always in the same way. How can you feel toward such a God the sense of communion that you have with your fellow-man? Are we told that God is near? That is just the trouble. He is too near for us to realize his presence. Are we told that he is always the same? But it is not uniformity we want. Our need is always changing and the helper we need must meet these constant changes with a change as constant.

It is a very real difficulty that I am voicing. It lies back of the widespread attack upon the new theology as denying the supernatural and making no place for miracles. What this attack really means is the fear that if the new view of God comes to prevail the old sense of personal intimacy which characterized the religion of the past must die out, that vague feelings of awe and worship will replace that communion of will with will which is essential to the continuance of vital religion.

Now, if this fear were justified, I for one should feel that those who attacked modern theology as destructive were quite in the right. We need, not only a God to worship from afar, but a God who can help us where we need to be helped, in the changing trials and responsibilities and dangers of our changing lives. And the test by which every theology—whether old or new—must stand or fall is its ability to provide for the satisfaction of this need.

We face, then, this curious situation, that while the *conception of God* as presented in modern theology is winning and attractive, just the kind of God we should love to have as Father and Friend, *the conception of God's relation to the world* is such that we find it difficult to draw the legitimate consequences of our belief in practical helpfulness. How is this anomaly to be explained?

The root of the whole difficulty, I am persuaded, lies in the ambiguity of the term "law." Law means uniformity, but we forget that there are two kinds of uniformity. There is uniformity of action and uniformity of method, and it makes all the difference in the world which of the two we mean. Uniformity of action is inconsistent with personality. It is the uniformity of the machine which always does the same thing, because it has no option. If God be a God of law in this sense it would indeed be useless to turn to him for help, for he could not help us, if he would. For him, as for the world in which he dwells, law would be a prison from which he could not escape.

But we may use the word "law" in quite a different sense. We may use it to describe uniformity of method rather than uniformity of action. So far from being inconsistent with personality, uniformity of this kind is the highest expression of personality. It is the mark of a consistent character that it knows how to shape means to ends; and can be trusted under any conceivable set of circumstances to do the thing that is right. The man who is under law in this sense will be constantly varying his action to meet the varying exigency, but the change will always be determined by principle and will lead therefore to results on which you can always count.

It is just so with God. When we say that he acts according to law we mean that all that he does is determined by a single consistent purpose. It is not that his acts never vary, but that his aim never varies. He has but one object, and that is to establish the kingdom of God in the world which he has made, by bringing the men and women who are its inhabitants into willing conformity to the character of Jesus Christ.

How is this purpose to be brought about. In the very same way in which Christians have always contended that it must be brought about. By *changing* whatever in the present order of things and in the lives of living men and women is inconsistent with this purpose. In other words, by new beginnings, or what our fathers were accustomed to call miracles. A miracle is an exceptional event wrought by God in the world for a moral purpose. It is the evidence of the presence in the world of a personal Spirit directing its course to a spiritual end.

It is a great mistake to think that

modern theology has no place for miracle. Modern science has indeed banished a certain conception of miracle, the conception which regards it as a purely arbitrary and isolated event without antecedents or consequences, a marvel or portent contradicting natural law, or at least, wholly unrelated to it. But in the sense in which we have just defined it as a new beginning which evidences to man in a peculiar sense the presence and the purpose of God, modern science shows us more clearly than ever before how indispensable it is for religion. All progress takes place through new beginnings. A new form appears not wholly to be explained by its antecedents, but prophetic of that which is to come after. A great man appears and sets a new standard for all succeeding generations. A flash of insight illumines the soul and through years to come we walk by the light of the heavenly vision. Saul is struck down before the gate of Damascus and the persecutor is changed into the apostle. Jesus is born in a tiny province of the Roman Empire and we date a new era in the history of mankind.

How shall we account for phenomena like these? What is their significance and meaning in the universe? This is a question which science cannot answer. It is concerned with causes, not with values. It registers the appearance of the new fact. It can determine the conditions under which it arose and describe the consequences which followed from it, but the why and wherefore is hidden from its ken. Critical scholarship may tell us who wrote the books of the Bible and when they wrote them. It may explain the literary forms they used and catalogue the materials upon which they drew. But when it has done all this it is as far as ever from explaining the influence which the Bible has exerted upon the spiritual life of man. How came it that in its pages men have heard God speaking directly to their own souls; how account for the persistence of its influence over so many centuries and among men of such widely different races? Religion answers, it is because God is really speaking to men in the book which he has prepared for this very purpose. And this discovery of God in events and experiences which to men without the clue seem destitute of spiritual significance, lies at the heart of the religious faith in miracle.

The difficulty in the older attitude toward miracle was not that men found God actively at work in the great creative personalities and events which accompanied the birth of the new religion, but that they concentrated their attention upon his presence there to the exclusion of his activity elsewhere. They tried to draw a hard-and-fast line between the miracles of the Bible and God's methods of self-disclosure to men of other races and other ages. They failed to recognize, or at all events, adequately to emphasize, the fact that God is as truly present, if in different degree and for different purposes, in our present experience as in the experience of the past; that he is as able today as ever to make new disclosures of his will and to give new evidence of his power. What we need to do is to realize afresh the continuity of God's redemptive activity, not to see less of him in the past, but to expect more from him in the present and the future.

Now, the most familiar example of

God's creative activity in the present is prayer. Prayer is the way in which the soul of man is renewed through contact with God. Here again modern theology has not altered the facts, though it has set them in a new light. Through its revelation of the divine consistency it has removed the element of arbitrariness which often attached to the older conception of prayer. It assures us that when we draw near to God in the spirit of faith we may confidently expect response; that it is as true today as in the days of Isaiah and St. Paul that through prayer we have access to the source of all power and renew our lives from day to day.

I have in mind a dear friend, now no longer among the living, about whose memory many asssociations cluster. A natural leader of men, far-sighted, wise in counsel, exquisite in tact, untiring in industry, he was in the truest sense of the term a man of affairs. But I think of him most of all as a man of prayer. More than once during a season of anxiety and strain I have seen him come into the Seminary chapel to lead the morning's worship, and as he prayed I have seen his face change before my eyes and grow buoyant and radiant under the renewing influence which came to him from communion with his God. Cuthbert Hall is to many a Union Seminary student a personal embodiment of that sonnet of Trench which he loved to quote:

Lo, what a change within us one short hour
Spent in thy presence will prevail to make,
What heavy burdens from our bosom take.
What parched grounds revive, as with a shower!
We kneel, and all around us seems to lower;
We rise, and all, the distant and the near,
Stands forth in sunny outline, brave and clear.
We kneel, how weak: we rise, how full of power!

What we need, then, above all, we who call ourselves Christians, is to learn from Jesus how to pray. Jesus realized as keenly as any of us moderns the duty of service. All day long he went about doing good. He was tireless in his ministry to the needy in body and spirit, feeding the hungry, healing the sick, comforting the sorrowing, forgiving the sinful, but he knew that he could give only what he had received. And so when night fell he left his disciples and went up into the mountain or shut his closet door that in secret he might commune with the Father who seeth in secret. It is what his disciples must do if we are to recover again for our generation the consciousness of God as the central fact and the supreme good, the unfailing source of strength and of wisdom, of inspiration and of comfort, of peace and of joy.

THE STUDENT VOLUNTEER CONVENTION OF 1914

ERNEST D. BURTON, D.D.
Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation
University of Chicago

Some days we are discouraged about Christianity. The world seems very evil and Christian enthusiasm sadly lacking. In such moments of depression those of us who were at the great convention which Professor Burton describes will recall the great hall, filled with thousands of the strongest of strong young lives, their intense interest and sane enthusiasm. Above all we shall recall that the convention represented a movement which has sent thousands of young men and women into the foreign field. Where in the history of the world is anything like this to be found? Why be pessimistic about the gospel when a new generation is consecrating itself to the propagation of the gospel?

The seventh International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions was attended by 3,984 students and professors representing 755 colleges and theological seminaries in the United States and Canada, by 279 missionaries and secretaries representing the mission boards of the United States and Canada, and by 768 editors, laymen, and special guests. These figures are themselves significant of the widespread interest of the colleges of the country in the subject of foreign missions. To one who believes in the foreign mission enterprise of the church, the presence of this great company of people in the convention hall at Kansas City was an inspiring sight.

But what did it really signify? Bigness is not necessarily greatness. What were the characteristics of the convention, and what does it promise for the future? No one could possibly hear all that was said, still less know all that was going on in the minds and hearts of four thousand students. But one may record a few broad and deep impressions.

It was a catholic body—though not indeed all-inclusive. It was not a congress of religions. It was a distinctly Christian convention with no representatives of the non-Christian religions save a few in the student body. It stood, moreover, for so-called evangelical Christianity. There were no Roman Catholics or Unitarians on the program. But within these broad limits all denominations and all schools of thought were represented. Men of widely different opinions stood on the same platform to plead for the great things of the Kingdom, and felt no need or impulse to add to their plea any word of bitterness or controversy. Of course we know that there are still differences of opinion which not only keep us in separate denominations, but prevent full co-operation in Christian work at home and abroad. But there was no echo of these on the platform of the Kansas City convention. This is itself a significant fact, carrying with it

a forecast of the time when a common interest in a great enterprise shall soften asperities even though not annihilating differences of opinion.

The meetings were all characterized by a notable combination of calmness and earnestness. After the expressions of enthusiasm for the various institutions from which the delegates came and for the convention itself, which were permitted at the outset, there was an almost total absence of audible response from the audience. There was no applause, no outward evidence of excitement, no waves of emotion sweeping over the audience.

But this was by no means the reflection of apathy or indifference. It was a deeply earnest assembly, listening intently to every address, joining sympathetically with those who led in prayer, and heartily in the hymns. Few speakers ventured on humorous remarks, and these few stirred no more than a ripple of laughter on the surface of the deep seriousness of the assembly.

Coupled with seriousness was a notable openness of mind on the part of the student body. No one knows, of course, in how many instances young men and women sought out older friends or fellow-students to discuss the question of their personal duty, or how many in the silence of their own rooms reached important decisions respecting their future work. But the number of instances of the former kind that came unsought to one's knowledge seemed clearly symptomatic of a widespread openness of mind to the claims of Christ and his service and led one to believe that a large number of momentous decisions were reached—yet, again let it be emphasized, not under excitement, but in quietness and calmness.

Being serious, the audiences were also discriminating. There were very few expressions, either in the great morning and evening assemblies, or in the many section conferences that filled the afternoon hours, that violated the canons of good taste and failed to deal fairly and seriously with a great opportunity. In the few instances in which there was such failure the response was fitted to the address. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," was the unspoken maxim of the convention.

What will the convention accomplish? No doubt many young men and women decided while at Kansas City, or will decide as a result of their attendance at the convention, to give themselves to foreign missionary service, and many of these will actually spend their lives in non-Christian countries. If it shall prove that some decided unwisely, the whole atmosphere of the convention gives reason to hope that the great majority of the decisions were of the kind that abide and that ought to abide. In this respect the convention must have been a healthful and helpful influence in the lives of the nearly four thousand delegates.

But perhaps even more far-reaching and significant will be the influence which will be exerted upon the moral and religious atmosphere of the colleges from which the students came and to which they have returned. No one who is closely in touch with the life of our American colleges and universities and who lays stress upon the moral aspects of life can doubt that there is great need of a purifying of moral life

and deepening of religious life in almost all of these institutions. A revival of religion in a student community cannot be in these days in its external features what it might have been two generations ago. It must be calm as well as deep, not stormy and excited. But there is no doubt that it is greatly needed. The greatest possibility of the Kansas City convention lies in this direction. A member of the faculty of a state university said, in effect, as the convention closed: "We are going back to ask the president of the university to lead in an effort to deepen and strengthen the religious life of the student body." The delegates from another university, assembled on their return journey, resolved to begin at once an effort to deepen not simply the interest in foreign missions, but especially the religious life of the student body, while the non-volunteer members of the delegation determined to undertake the support of a man on the foreign field.

These events were probably only typical of many such. If the calm, deeply earnest spirit of the Kansas City convention can be reproduced in a goodly number of the 755 colleges and universities there represented, the future historian of college life in America may date from the year 1914 the beginning of a much-needed new era in the moral and religious life of American colleges.

THE MODERN SADDUCEE

JAMES M. CAMPBELL, D.D.
Avalon, California
Author of "Paul the Mystic," Etc.

The Pharisee and the Sadducee have disappeared from history as Jewish sects, but their spiritual descendants are still to be found. The modern Pharisee has been more in evidence than the Sadducee. He has been pilloried, and has been made the butt of much rude jesting. To be called a Pharisee has been tantamount to being called a hypocrite, and everything savoring of Phariseeism has been unsparingly condemned.

The Sadducee has been less in evidence but he is at length coming to his own. While the Pharisee, like his modern prototype, the Puritan, is dying out the Sadducee is becoming a great multitude. It is no longer Phariseeism that is the bane of religion but Sadduceeism. There is hardly enough conviction left in some quarters out of which to make a good Pharisee. The religion of today is largely a thing of Sadducean softness and compromise.

With all his faults the Pharisee was a man to be respected, if not admired. The common people adored him and took him for the model saint. Narrow, bigoted, and intolerant he undoubtedly

was, but he was intensely religious; and if he sometimes kept his morality and his religion in water-tight compartments, not allowing them to mix, he did nothing more than many religionists in all ages have done. The contrast between the Pharisee and the Sadducee was marked. Where the Pharisee was narrow the Sadducee was broad; where the Pharisee was bigoted the Sadducee was tolerant; where the Pharisee was scrupulous, the Sadducee was indifferent; while the Pharisee took his religion seriously the Sadducee took his lightly; while the Pharisee was satisfied with his religion the Sadducee was satisfied with his life; while the Pharisee had a sense of the spiritual realm the Sadducee had only a world-vision—all his thoughts and aims and hopes being bounded by this terrestrial ball.

Naturally enough, the easy-going Sadducee disliked the prophets. They disturbed his peace, and put thorns in his cosy nest of self-indulgence. He allied himself with the priests, forming within the priesthood a sort of "priestly aristocracy" or sacerdotal nobility. When a priest, he used his office as a ladder to worldly power. When a layman he joined himself to the rich and prosperous who have their portion in this world. For the sake of his own personal advancement he was ready to adopt the manners and customs of the gentile nations, and was specially desirous of grafting Greek culture on to Hebrew faith. But while indifferent to religion, and untroubled by ordinary scruples, he was far from indifferent to the outward forms of religion. It is true that he rejected "the traditions of the elders," but that was because he adhered exclusively to the written word; rejecting all oral law, and setting himself against all innovations. He was a conservative of the first water.

Along with intense conservatism as to outward forms went a spirit of denial as to spiritual realities. He denied the existence of "spirits and angels," and of everything supramundane; he denied the doctrine of the resurrection and held that the soul of man perishes with his body; he was an agnostic touching everything beyond the present life, and took a worldly view of religion, never going beyond the temporal rewards and punishments of the Pentateuch, and maintaining that a man is rewarded in this life according to his deeds; and that consequently prosperity is a sign of piety and adversity a sign of wickedness. Ruling out the punishments of the after life, he saw to it that transgressors of the law got their due mead of punishment here.

In his religion the Sadducee was a strange blend of legalist and rationalist; in his life he was an out-and-out materialist. Just as the kinship of the Pharisee was with the Stoic, the kinship of the Sadducee was with the Epicurean. He sneered, as his modern prototype does, at other-worldliness, and took as his motto, "One world at a time." His philosophy of life might be summed up in the words, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

Jesus warned his disciples to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees"; and he had to explain that by the leaven of these sects he meant their teachings. The teaching of the Sadducees of which he bade them be-

ware did not concern any particular doctrine, but referred to its general drift and scope. Their unspiritual materialistic teachings was working like the leaven of iniquity in the society of their day, just as it is in the society of today. And never perhaps has the Savior's warning had more need of being sounded than at the present time. We have the same condition of things that prevailed in England after the Restoration, when a carnival of licentiousness followed temporary restraint. We have become pleasure-mad. Self-denial is a forgotten virtue. We pad the cross; and cushion our hard duties. We are like the pilgrim, who, when required to perform penance by walking a certain number of miles with peas in his boots, took the precaution to boil the peas before setting out on his journey. George Fox, in his day, inveighed against "the Sadducean intellect," meaning by that an intellect steeped in worldliness, an intellect whose purblind vision left out of sight spiritual and eternal realities, an intellect that scorned the inner voice and the inner light and followed the lower lights of worldly wisdom and prudence. This is the Sadducean leaven of which we have to beware, and from which we have need to be delivered.

The modern Sadducee is as hard to reach as was his ancient predecessor. When his heart is not "waxed gross," it is protected by indifference as by a coat of mail. His defenses resemble the walls of mud which Napoleon found surrounding certain fortifications in his Egyptian war, and into which the balls of his heaviest artillery went spluttering out of sight. It is a notable fact that there is no record of a single Sadducee being converted and becoming a follower of Christ. When John the Baptist saw "many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his baptism," he was carried off his feet with astonishment and exclaimed, "Ye offsprings of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come!" We can understand his wonder while condemning his violence of speech. He was careful, however, to exhort them not to trust in their special prerogatives as children of Abraham, but to "bring forth fruit meet for repentance." How far they profited by his admonition we know not. That he did not regard their case as hopeful is certain; that he did not regard it as utterly hopeless is equally certain. The grace of God is equal to the salvation of a Sadducee; and in that is found its greatest triumph.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. I

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH D.
Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago

The past ten years have seen something like a revolution in the work of the Sunday school. The churches have come to see that it is vital to the development of Christianity. A church without a Sunday school is an army without recruiting stations; and recruits badly trained are sadly inefficient. The work of the Religious Education Association, and the reorganization of great denominational boards, have served to inaugurate reforms of the utmost importance. Sunday schools have been graded, admirable new teaching material has been published, directors of religious education have been appointed in churches, departments of religious education in theological seminaries have been developed, and religious psychology has its increasing libraries. The BIBLICAL WORLD *has been a pioneer in this field, and the articles of Professor Soares will be of increasing service to the growing number of clergymen who are eager to develop the really educational function of the church.*

It is strange that there ever should have arisen an antithesis between education and spiritual power. Perhaps the fault was on both sides. But with education everywhere defined today in spiritual and social terms, there is no reason for anyone to fear that a cold intellectualism will replace religious fervor. Education even in our schools is quite as much concerned with emotional reactions, with volitional activities, with the controls of conduct, as with intellectual apprehension. Education, indeed, is the whole process by which the individual is fitted to become an efficient member of the social organism; and while this includes an ever-widening knowledge, it is supremely a matter of the quality of personality.

There are those who are quite willing to admit the educational aspect of the work of the church, but they would insist that this must be made subsequent to the saving or evangelizing work of the church. They would say that persons must first be born into the family of God and then trained to be effective members of the family. So some ministers teach the saints in the morning and evangelize the sinners in the evening; some Sunday schools teach the pupils for so many Sundays and seek conversions on other Sundays. But there is no real antithesis here. Any adequate conception of religious education includes evangelism, expects earnest decisions, makes provision for classes on personal religion. But the endeavor is made so to understand the

real nature of the various religious experiences that the whole process may be helpful, vigorous, continuous, and therefore educative.

As a matter of fact, all the work of the church is educational, the proper division being that some of it is educational directly and some of it indirectly. The preaching, teaching, reading, singing, assembling of ourselves together, the promotion of sociability, in fact, almost all of the activities within the church walls are directly educational. We are consciously seeking the development of religious personality. On the other hand, the work of the church in ministry to the needy, the poor, the sorrowing, the unfortunate, the wayward, in relating itself to the social and civic movements of reform and advancement, in contributing to the great missionary enterprises at home and abroad, is not undertaken primarily for the education of its own members. And yet these ministries and activities are educational in the highest degree, and we are just beginning to realize how important it is that their educational character should be carefully questioned, e.g., the effect upon Christian beneficences of the raising of money by "catch-penny" devices.

A study of the educational work of the church, therefore, is an attempt to discover how direct educational activities may be most effectively carried on and how all the activities of the church may have a sound educational quality.

The scientific literature upon this subject is not very large. It is unfortunate that the demand for books on religious education has resulted in premature publication by many persons whose knowledge on the subject was quite meager. There are some fairly good books of a popular nature dealing with practical methods of church work in which the educational idea is prominent. And there is a large output of popular works on Sunday-school methods some of which are accurate and helpful. Up to the present time the scientific study of religious experience has been undertaken rather from the psychological than from the educational point of view, and therefore the most important scientific works are in the field of the psychology of religion. The works of James, Starbuck, Leuba, Davenport, Irving King, Pratt, Coe, Ames, Farnell are in this field and are a proper preparation for our present study. As these books are already treated in a companion reading course in the *American Institute of Sacred Literature*, their general position may here be assumed. We shall consider our subject in the following arrangement:

1. Books dealing with the general problem of the educational work of the church:
   Faunce, *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry.*
   H. C. King, *Personal and Ideal Elements in Education.*
   Coe, *Education in Religion and Morals.*
2. Some books on educational psychology as a broad basis for particular religious application:
   Thorndike, *Education.*
   Horne, *Psychological Principles of Education.*
   H. Thistleton Mark, *The Unfolding of Personality.*
   Sisson, *The Essentials of Character.*
   James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology.*
3. Books especially concerned with educational problems of the church:

Burton and Mathews, *Principles and Ideals in the Sunday School.*
Cope, *Efficiency in the Sunday School.*
Cope, *The Efficient Layman.*
Haslett, *The Pedagogical Bible School.*

4. A group of books dealing with the special problems of youth:
Kirkpatrick, *Fundamentals of Child Study.*
Forbush, *The Boy Problem.*
Hoben, *The Minister and the Boy.*
Milne, *The Church and the Young Man's Game.*

5. A few books of educational vision suggestive of the problems of the future:
Dewey, *School and Society.*
Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education.*
Blow, Hill, Harrison, *The Kindergarten.*
Montessori, *The Montessori Method.*

President Faunce in his Yale lectures, *The Educational Ideal in the Ministry*, upholds the thesis that the minister's entire conception of his work is to be educational. Over against the priest and the orator he places the teacher—not the pedagogue, of course, but the teacher, the man who leads by presenting constraining ideals. This opens up the whole question of the modern view of the world and revelation. Faunce points out how this must be faced, and how it must be pedagogically presented to an "ungraded congregation." Those modernists who have discarded the Bible as old fashioned would do well to ponder carefully the chapter on "Modern Uses of Ancient Scripture. "It is one of the best presentations that has been made of the abiding value of the Bible in religious education, and this just because of the frank acceptance of the modern point of view. Not less serious is the minister's problem in relation to the leadership of his people in right thought and action upon the complicated ethical questions of our day. With fine discrimination Faunce points out the various dangers to which the ministry is liable and shows how the educational ideal can be followed. As regards the direct educational work of the church, especially the organization and conduct of the Sunday school, it must be dependent upon the minister. He must fortify himself by the study of the best books on psychology and educational method for leadership in this work. And the theological seminaries must prepare men far more thoroughly than they have done to be such educational leaders. It is extraordinary that so many ministers still think of themselves only as preachers and leave to untrained laymen the conduct of the *school* of the church. The strictures of Dr. Faunce upon our Sunday-school system are none too severe and the remedy must be largely with the minister.

It is evident that if the task of the church is to be conceived as educational it ought to appeal in a special manner to our college men and women. Why it has not done so, how it may do so, and the great opportunities that are here open, are admirably treated in the chapter on the "Relation of Church and College." And finally, it is shown how the minister's own education may be furnished by his task. Every profession has its belittling tendencies, and not the least the ministry. How may the minister avoid the temptations of his calling and grow more a man as he becomes more a minister? It is the educational ideal that will save him.

Dr. Faunce's book is not revolutionary. A man may read it superficially and think that there is nothing new in

it. But a thoughtful minister may read it over again every year and find the meaning of his task enhanced as he feels the spiritual summons to be what Jesus himself was, a teacher.

President King's book, *Personal and Ideal Elements in Education*, is a collection of addresses, some of which might not at first seem to have much relation to the church. But a careful reading of these masterly essays will reveal the principles which underlie the educational work of the church. And while the clear psychological and pedagogical statements help us to see the exact nature of our task and estimate it scientifically, the warm religious spirit with which Dr. King always writes will help us to realize the temper and faith in which that task must be carried on.

In an inaugural address (now in printed form) as president of Oberlin, where he might seem to be concerned simply with a college audience, there come out those fundamental ideas which we so greatly need in our church work. Its very title, "The Primacy of the Person," is a challenge for the reconstruction of much of our religious endeavor, and its main contentions are in the field of religious education; these, for example, that the school is to teach the fine art of living, that education is not intellectualism, that the distinction between the sacred and the secular disappears in any genuine education, that appreciation of music and art as well as of great literature is a high educational achievement, that the expression of activity is vital in any educational method, that the objective spirit is far more needed than the introspective, that genuine reverence must guard another's moral initiative, that character is caught rather than taught, that the great ends of education are culture, character, and social efficiency. The minister would do well to see the significance of these ideals for our schools and colleges and then seriously consider how far they are followed in the church.

In "The Fundamental Nature of Religion" Dr. King sets forth the relations between religion and education which make both more significant. He shows that in their ultimate aims, spirit, method, and results, they are one. It sounds little like the pedagogue to say that the highest results of education are convictions and ideals. We had thought they were the result of religion in the soul. But the culture of religion in the soul is an educative process. Schools ought to do it with social life, discipline, curriculum, and personal leadership of teachers, and churches ought to do it in the same way. And when Dr. King quotes Kaftan of Berlin as saying that the greatest problem of life is the problem of the appreciative understanding of the great personalities of history in order to make a plea for the study of Jesus in our colleges, we see how well the church might be equipped to meet this supreme problem.

In the address on "Religious Education as Conditioned by Modern Psychology and Pedagogy" the minister will not get a lot of ready-made methods suitable for the immediate needs of his church. He will get some fundamental principles which will repay careful thought and which he may work out in many applications in his own work.

The address most directly upon our

problem is that dealing with "Christian Training and the Revival as Methods of Converting Men." It is one of the most careful studies that has been made on the subject. The essential qualities of each method with its advantages and dangers are pointed out in clear, psychological analysis. Dr. King would keep both methods, each in its place: not the revival for regeneration and training for sanctification; that is a conventional and unreal distinction; but continuous efforts, never without enthusiasms, and special efforts, always with self-control and respect for personality, helping different individuals according to different temperaments and needs. King makes large use of "the subliminal consciousness" of James. Psychologists are not at all agreed that any great help can be secured from this theory, and it would be wise to use it with caution.

Let it be said finally that Dr. King's buoyant and affirmative faith in a personal God may be a great help to some who have been troubled by the god-symbol, which is all that some psychology of religion affords.

Perhaps Professor Coe's book, *Education in Religion and Morals*, should not be included here, as it is to be supposed that everyone interested in the educational work of the church has read it. Yet it ought to be included, for, although written ten years ago, it remains on the whole, the most satisfactory book upon the subject. Professor Coe was one of the earliest workers in the new religious education and has remained one of the leaders. This book presents very clearly the leading ideas of the modern educational movement and applies them to the problems of moral and religious life. Particularly valuable are the discussions on the unity of the whole educational process, the connection between the principles of modern education and the essential principles of religion, the social character of education and of religion. Coe sounds a needed note of warning when he lays great emphasis upon the significance of leadership. He advocates this in church and family life, points out the importance of the young sharing mature interests as well as the mature understanding youthful interests; and very vitally connects this principle with the religious idea of fellowship with God.

The second part deals with the "religious impulse," which is the least satisfactory discussion in the book. It would be well to consult an article by Professor Coe in the *American Journal of Theology* for April, 1914, on "The Origin and Nature of Children's Faith in God," in which the author presents the interesting suggestion that this has its basis in the parental instinct. He believes that children come to an appreciation of the paternal conception of God by the exercise of what is essentially a parental attitude toward dolls, pets, and persons who elicit sympathy. This discussion and the trenchant criticism in the same article upon the much overworked theory of recapitulation presents Coe's more complete thought on these subjects. The origin of religion in the individual is a difficult problem and must be pursued in the books on the psychology of religion, but at least it is necessary to be careful in speaking of a religious instinct or impulse. Religion is not so primary as that. It is a more

complex experience growing out of social relations and ideals.

Coe's treatment of genetic psychology, while brief, is very helpful, and his sketch of the normal religious development should be an ideal for every minister.

Of course, the discussion of the institutions of religion, particularly of the Sunday school, represents the point of view of 1904. Much progress has been made since then, to which Professor Coe has in no small measure contributed. The graded curriculum has established itself. However, the problem of materials for the various stages of development is more acute than ever. The demand for the unification of the educational forces of the church has been heeded in many quarters, but the situation is still practically what is here so justly criticized. The vital question of religious and moral education in Christian academies and colleges, and in state schools, has been greatly to the fore in the last decade. Perhaps some progress has been made, but the elements of the problem are still as here stated and merit earnest continued consideration.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Is the minister of today willing to accept the educational ideal with all that it involves?
2. How can the minister become the educational leader of his church and still retain the initiative of the laymen?
3. Can the moral aim be kept paramount in all education?
4. In what sense can evangelism be made truly educational?
5. Can there be an education in "spirituality"?
6. Is religion an instinct? If not, how does it arise in human experience?

SOME FURTHER WORKS

Nicholas Murray Butler, *The Meaning of Education.*
Nicholas Murray Butler, *et al*, *Principles of Religious Education.*
Volumes of the Religious Education Association.
George E. Dawson, *The Child and His Religion.*
Felix Adler, *Moral Instruction of Children.*
W. W. Smith, *Religious Education.*

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS[1]

It is necessary before taking up the class work of the present month to get a very definite point of view from which to approach it. The members of the class are more or less familiar with the Gospels. They have always been accustomed to think of them from the point of view of the study of the life of Christ. Their object, therefore, led them to find out all that they could about the life of Christ from any of the gospels; it mattered not what the source of the information was, provided the facts were there. The purpose of the present study is something quite different and has

[1]The suggestions relate to the fifth month's work, the student's material for which appears in the *Biblical World* for January and February, and may be obtained in pamphlet reprints for use with classes. Address: THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE, The University of Chicago.

to do with the reports, first verbal and then written, about Jesus which through various stages were crystallized into the Gospels as we now have them. Each of the separate reports must be considered, therefore, to have its own characteristics due to the personality, the purpose, and the sources of information open to the author. To put the members of the class into the attitude necessary to approach the Gospels in this way is difficult but not impossible, and the result is most illuminating.

It will easily be seen that the frequent reading of a single gospel, especially with the help of an outline, is the best possible way to get the "feeling" for that gospel which will give a true appreciation of it. It is recommended, therefore, that members of the class agree with the leader to read the particular gospel under consideration, if possible, daily—the entire gospel at one sitting. If this is too much to ask, then let it be read twice or even once during the week, but all at one time. If the gospel cannot be read thus frequently, then the full reading of it should come at the end of the two weeks of daily study rather than at the beginning, because following out the directions for study each day will have opened the eyes of the student to many things which will help him to get the right impression from the full reading.

At this point it is also desirable, if possible, to introduce the use of a harmony of the Gospels. *The Harmony of the Gospels* by Stevens and Burton is perhaps the best one to secure. The members of the class might, if they prefer, cut up testaments, placing the Gospel of Mark as the basis, and pasting it into a notebook, leaving the major portion of each page blank. The latter part of the month when the Gospel of Matthew is taken up, the material of Matthew which is not based on that of Mark may be pasted in at the place where it would naturally occur. This process would present visually facts which, if only told or learned from the direction sheet, would not make so strong an impression.

Here, as always, the purpose is to get the members of the class back into the atmosphere of the first century, and any contribution the leader can make and any task which he can assign which will produce this result is worthy of consideration.

Program I

Leader: Bookmaking in the Roman Empire in the first century. The use of books and methods of circulation.

Members: (1) A biographical sketch of the author of Mark's Gospel, so far as the New Testament supplies direct or inferential data. (2) The picture presented by the Gospel of Mark of the *Man of Convictions* concerning (*a*) the formalities of religion such as fasting, ceremonial washing, almsgiving; (*b*) social exclusiveness; (*c*) worthy uses of the Sabbath. (3) The picture presented by the Gospel of Mark of the *Man of Power* (*a*) over nature; (*b*) over bodily disease and death; (*c*) over unsound minds; (*d*) over sin and so-called evil spirits. (4) Mark's picture of Jesus on his last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. (5) The author's reassurances to those who wait for the return of Jesus in power. (6) The story of the death of Jesus and his final triumph.

Subject for discussion: (1) What in the Gospel of Mark would most deeply have impressed me had I been a Christian living in the Roman Empire. (2) What in the Gospel of Mark deeply impressed me, a Christian in the twentieth century.

Program II

Leader: (1) A careful explanation of the form and purpose of a harmony of the Gospels. (2) A rapid survey of the main sections of the outline of Matthew's Gospel, noting the discourses alternating with illustrative events. (3) A comparison of this outline with that of the Gospel of Mark.

Members: (1) The use which the author

of Matthew's Gospel makes of the lineage of Jesus, the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning him, and the stories connected with his birth. (2) The testimony to Jesus' messiahship and the extent of his mission as presented by the author of Matthew in the events of his early ministry. (3) The characteristics of a Christian based upon Matt., chaps. 5–7. (Consider these also in the light of the first century.) (4) The character and place of Peter in the estimation of the writer of Matthew's Gospel. (5) Stories from this gospel which typically picture the rejection of Jesus by the Jews. (6) An outline under not more than ten heads of the argument of Matthew for the messiahship of Jesus.

Subject for discussion: Which gospel, that of Matthew or that of Mark, is most helpful to us today? (Do not overlook the Sermon on the Mount and the principles of the kingdom of God presented by Matthew nor the compelling force of the *Man of Power* as pictured by Mark.)

REFERENCE READING

Burton, *A Short Introduction to the Gospels*, chaps. i, ii, iv; Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (this book should be read in its entirety if possible during this month and the next); Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament;* Wernle, *The Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus;* Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, chap. ii; Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 203–88; Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus;* Scott-Moncreiff, *St. Mark and the Triple Tradition;* Jülicher, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 292–329; Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 101–24; Bennett, *The Life of Christ according to St. Mark;* Burton and Mathews, *Constructive Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 20, 21.

Read from Hastings, four-volume and one-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, articles, The Gospels, John Mark, Gospel of Mark, Apostle Matthew, Gospel of Matthew, Text of the New Testament, New Testament, New Testament Canon.

CURRENT OPINION

The Significance of the Recent Religious Events in Japan

The two events which have called forth much comment in the current Japanese literature are the conferences of the Minister of Education with the representatives of the three religions, Shintoism, Buddhism, and Christianity, on separate dates, and the general religious convention which followed. These meetings occurred in the first part of last November. Since the conference of the Vice-Minister of the Home Affairs with the representatives of the three religions in February, 1912, the Bureau of Religions has been transferred from the Department of Interior to that of Education. This change is followed by the above-mentioned conferences of the Minister of Education with the representatives of the religions, at the invitation of the former. At these conferences the Minister of Education exchanged his views on the relation of education and religion with those of the religious leaders. The religious convention was attended by the representatives of religions, politicians, leading educators, business men, and others interested in religion and morals, to the number of 309 men. The meeting was presided over by Baron Sakatani, the mayor of Tokyo. The resolution to hold the convention annually was passed. A committee of thirty-five was appointed to look after the interests of the body.

Among the speakers were: Mr. Shibata, a Shinto priest; Mr. Dagi, a Buddhist priest; the Rev. Ozaki of Japan Congregational Church; Dr. Inoue of the Imperial University; and Baron Sakatani. There were other prominent speakers at this meeting on the afternoon of November 5 and during the luncheon which followed. The relation of education and religion, the necessity of co-operation on the part of the religious bodies for the moral uplift of the people, and other important subjects relative to religion were freely discussed. The meeting was pronounced on the whole a great success.

Now what do these events mean? Dr. Ukita in the last December number of the *Taiyo* contributes a very thoughtful article on the "Effects of the Japanese Religious Convention." The two main results which he mentions are the closer relation between the clergy and the laity and the furtherance of international friendship and peace. He rightly points out that there must be an intimate relation between the religious leaders and laymen to carry out successfully the program of the moral and social advancement of the people, and so long as one religionist despises another religionist there can be no peace and progress among the people as well as among the nations of the world. The above religious convention brings together the clergy and the laity on equal terms and tends more and more to cement the different religious bodies in Japan at least for the work of the social and moral welfare of the people. Briefly stated, the recent religious phenomena signify that the educators in Japan have fully come to recognize the necessity of religion for the moral development of her youth, that the leading men in general are desirous of applying religion not merely to education but to larger social, moral, and political problems, and that one of the marked tendencies at the present is along the line of the spiritual development of the Japanese nation.

Death of Professor von Soden

The daily papers report the death of Professor Hermann von Soden at Berlin on January 15, 1914. Baron von Soden was trying to get on a train in the Berlin sub-

way when he met his death. This tragic incident removes one of the leading New Testament scholars of Germany, and a foremost representative of New Testament textual study. He was born in Cincinnati in 1852, and was educated at Tübingen. He became minister of the Jerusalem Church in Berlin in 1887, and in 1889 began to lecture in the University there. Among his books are *Commentaries* on Philippians and Hebrews, and a *History of Early Christian Literature.* His great contribution, however, has been *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, which involved a new and highly ingenious system of listing Greek manuscripts, a new theory of the history of the text, a remarkable analysis of the minor types of the mediaeval text, and finally a reconstruction upon new principles of what von Soden called the earliest text attainable. While certain elements of this vast undertaking are open to serious question, no one can deny the ability, energy, and fidelity with which Professor von Soden undertook and carried through his great enterprise. He lived to see his work completed, the final volume containing what he believed to be the earliest attainable text appearing in 1913.

Protestantism and Catholicism Differ in Method

That Protestantism methodologically differs from Catholicism is maintained by James Lindsay in an article, in the *Constructive Quarterly*, December, 1913, on "Protestantism and Catholicism: Two Methods Even More Than Two Religions." Some writers on the history of Protestantism hold that Protestant scholasticism substituted the authority of the Bible for that of the Roman church. But Dr. Lindsay is of the opinion that it is not correct to say that Protestantism attempted to substitute the Scripture for the infallible church. The formal principle of Catholicism, in his view, is dependence on the joint authority of the church and Scripture. Accordingly it gives no freedom to individual judgment. All private interpretations on the matters of religion and theology are excluded. The rights of the individual are absolutely ignored. Protestantism, on the other hand, stands for the authority of the Scripture and the right of free inquiry. A special emphasis is placed upon the latter. The Scripture as such is of no authoritative value unless it is rationally validated by reason. Nothing is authoritative which does not commend itself to reason. We must submit all the doctrines of Christianity to the judgment of reason. Here Dr. Lindsay brings in God and calls him the Absolute Reason. God being the Absolute Reason, whatever comes from him is rational to the human reason. We must not discard the doctrines of the deity of Christ and of the Trinity uncritically; they must be made rational. So the watchword of Protestantism is the principle of liberty while that of Catholicism is external authority.

In this analysis of the two systems there is involved a difficulty of interpretation in view of the fact that Dr. Lindsay does not clearly define what Protestantism he has in mind. For example, if he means by Protestantism that of the seventeenth century, the methodological distinction he draws between Catholicism and Protestantism cannot hold good. In essence Catholicism and traditional Protestantism are based upon the supernatural authority. But it can be rightly admitted that Protestantism as a whole inevitably leads to critical judgments as methodological criteria of theology.

A Prophet of the Soul

The *Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1914, contains an article with this title by John Burroughs. Its subject-matter is M. Bergson. Mr. Burroughs finds in M. Bergson a prophet of the soul like Goethe, Words-

worth, Emerson, and Whitman. M. Bergson is a prophet of the soul because he, as the others, opens up to us a new world and a new life. The world we find in M. Bergson is no static, finished world; it is ever moving and creating itself. The creative impulse which pushes this world onward is constantly in its creative activity. There is no rest in the whole process of evolution. And the life which M. Bergson reveals to us is not a life determined by the mechanical causation of the scientist; but it is free, ever creating itself; it is struggling to get mastery over the forces of matter. The means by which M. Bergson opens up a new world and a new life is not mere intellect; it is our intuitions. Intellect can enable us only to see the world and life as the workings of mechanical forces. But our intuitions bring to us a rich and deep insight into the heart of the world and of life. *Creative Evolution* as a philosophy could not escape attacks.

But vitalized by such a style and humanized by a spirit so in fellowship with the highest emotions and aspirations of the soul, Bergson's philosophy, I think, stands a better chance of surviving than any other system of our time. It is a proclamation of emancipation to minds in the bondage of materialism and mechanism. . . . . Bergson is an inspired man, and begets in us that inward joy and exultation which is the gift of "a prophet of the soul."

The Sanity of Jesus

In the *Expositor*, October, November, and December, 1913, there has appeared a translation of Albert Schweitzer's *Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu* under the title: "The Sanity of the 'Eschatological' Jesus." Schweitzer in his work, *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis. Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu*, had attributed a thoroughgoing eschatology to the self-consciousness of Jesus. Since then he has studied medicine and feels that he is qualified to speak on the sanity of Jesus. If Jesus was thoroughly eschatological and apocalyptic in his thinking as Schweitzer would make him to be, the question has risen whether Jesus was mentally sane in considering himself as the apocalyptic Messiah. So a task has fallen upon Schweitzer to solve this problem. Schweitzer accordingly makes a critical examination of the views of Drs. de Loosten, William Hirsch, and Binet-Sanglé, who have pronounced Jesus more or less insane. Schweitzer contends that the wholly eschatological views of Jesus can be explained in the light of the contemporary Jewish thought of his time and that the views of these men are untenable. Jesus was mentally sound in spite of his eschatology.

Schweitzer gives the following concluding remarks:

(1) That the materials made use of in these studies [i.e., of the foregoing men] are to a large extent unhistorical. (2) In the materials which are historical a large number of actions and sayings of Jesus impresses these authors as being pathological because they have too little acquaintance with contemporary points of view to be able to do them justice. . . . . (3) On the basis of these false presuppositions, and with the aid of hypothetical symptoms, they construct clinical pictures which are themselves artificial. . . . . (4) The only characteristics which, ... conceivably call for psychiatric discussion—Jesus' lofty conception of himself, and perhaps also hallucinations at the baptism —are very far from being sufficient to prove the existence of mental disease.

Speaking Out for Protestantism

There was recently held in the city of Washington, D.C., a theater mass meeting in which all the Protestant denominations of the city were represented. "Why We Are Protestants" was the subject under discussion. The people were told frankly why Protestantism exists in the world and what it stands for; why the Protestant church still refuses to admit the Pope's authority. The daily press gave prominent space to the mass meeting, reprinting the gist of the discussion offered. Meetings of this character will command public attention and will not merely arouse suspicion of rabid religious intolerance.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

Co-operation with Mission Fields

In the reports of the recent conferences in Asia of the Continuation Committee of the epoch-making Edinburgh Conference of 1910, cheering indications are found of a deepening conviction of the necessity of interdenominational co-operation to the permanent prosperity of the missionary enterprise. To cite some significant utterances:

At Madras: "The Conference feels that the time has come for all missionary societies to recognize that the wider interests of the kingdom of God must always have priority over the rights and privileges of individual missions, provided that this principle be carried out without prejudice to the liberty of individual Christians."

At Bombay: "This Conference earnestly hopes that all missionary bodies and Indian Christians will thoughtfully consider how existing divisions in the church of Christ in India may be lessened, and how the desire of many for one national Indian church may eventually be fulfilled."

At Shanghai: "The church of Christ is essentially one and it is the duty of those who call upon the name of Christ in every place to manifest this unity to the world. We can therefore set before the church in China no lower ideal than that of a manifest and organic unity. It should include all those within the Chinese nation who hold the truth of our Lord Jesus Christ. But this unity must be a result of spiritual growth rather than of outward organization."

At Tsmanfu: "This Conference finds itself in almost unanimous agreement that the tendency of the Chinese church is toward the formation and development of a nation-wide church, such church coming by way of the federation of existing churches."

To these utterances were joined many suggestions and recommendations of forms and methods of co-operation as in the organization of federal and provincial councils, in the production of Christian literature, in language schools and training schools, in evangelistic effort. It can hardly be doubted that such co-operation is leading directly in very many instances to organic union, in the establishment of the church of Christ in China, Japan, and India.

At the All-India Conference held at Serampore, Dr. Mott presiding, 194 Christian students representing seventy-four different institutions and twelve language areas met "to hear the call of India and the church of Christ in India and to consecrate themselves to obey that call." There were no Panjabis, Bengalis, or Madrasis there, but all were alike the servants of Christ. The living unity in this assembly of diverse nationalities was more plainly declared with each session. The complete evangelization of India through the breaking-down of barriers of caste and race seems to be brought near in the organization of this indigenous student Christian movement.

A New Era for Serampore College

It is good news that Serampore College is likely at last, nearly a century after its establishment, at great cost, to fulfil the expectations of Carey, Marshman, and Ward. Founded in 1818 with a charter from the Danish government authorizing the conferring of degrees, the only Christian college in India thus privileged, it has passed through many vicissitudes and after a long period of complete suspension of all instruction of college grade has recently been

reorganized. Its latest reports show an arts college, a higher theological school, and a vernacular theological department. The Indian government has expressed its approval of its standards by granting it a considerable measure of university affiliation. It has now enrolled 165 students, and applications for admission are so numerous that it appears quite certain that the limit of 300 will soon be reached. Beyond that number the college authorities in the interests of sound educational discipline and efficiency do not wish at present to go. The little group of sixteen students in the higher theological school represent the leading Christian denominations and all parts of India. Of the four new students of 1913 one is an Anglican, one Baptist, one Congregationalist, one Presbyterian. Two of them are graduates of the University of Calcutta, with distinction. Here is an instance of successful co-operation in precisely that kind of education in which it has been too easily assumed co-operation would be found extremely difficult, if not quite impossible.

The Religious Effect of the Balkan War

Dr. George D. Herrick, former missionary of the American Board at Constantinople, writes to the *Missionary Review of the World* of the probable effect of the Balkan War upon the progress, in the Near East, of the kingdom of God. It is to be expected that Greece and Servia, always intolerant, will continue to impose serious limitations upon missionary endeavor. The situation will be quite different in Albania. Now a free state, she turns to America with an appeal for schools and hospitals. "Some Albanians go so far as to declare themselves ready to abandon Islam, forced upon them by the Turks, and accept Protestant Christianity as being near to the Christianity which was theirs centuries ago." In Turkey, too, the feeling toward the Americans is very friendly, the result of the large patronage which in recent years Moslems have given to our high schools, colleges, and hospitals, and in particular to the generous and sympathetic relief work administered by American hands in the midst of the appalling suffering following the war. They are ready as never before to listen to the gospel message. This is Dr. Herrick's conclusion: "The chance offered especially to American Christians for spiritual investments that yield a hundred-fold is as great certainly, in the Nearer as in the Farther East."

The United Missionary Campaign

Commencing with the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of David Livingstone, representatives of the Home and Foreign Mission Boards of North America launched a United Missionary Campaign which gives promise of large returns for the Kingdom. Its object is to bring the world needs and opportunities before the Christians of North America by a comprehensive and sustained effort to lead out the whole church into the discharge of its total missionary duty in this crisis hour of national and world history. It aims to stop wasteful and ineffective methods, to "put system in place of spasm." It advocates a budget planned twelve months in advance. This educational movement is to cover a period of three years, with as many as five hundred conferences, in all conducted by twenty teams of speakers, two days in a place. These men will seek to put before the leaders of the local church the immediacy of the present opportunity, the inadequacy of present educational and financial plans, and the possibilities of co-operation between denominations. Nearly fifty denominations are united in this movement, which for this year is centering its attention on the territory east of the Mississippi, with some special efforts also in California. It is to culminate this season

in a proposed nation-wide, every-member canvass for all missionary and benevolent interests during the month of March. The great message of the United Missionary Campaign is inspirational and is identified with the interests of the Kingdom, not with any denominational outlook. That there is need of this aggressive campaign is shown by the estimate recently made that there are yet from fourteen to fifteen million church members yet to be enlisted as givers.

The Unworthy Attitude of Christian Nations to Opium

One of the most important and pressing questions of an international character which today is claiming attention is the question of the suppression of the traffic in opium. There is urgent need for education of public opinion through the combined efforts of pulpit, platform, and press.

At the International Conference on Opium held last July at The Hague there were representatives of twenty-four governments present, all of whom signed a treaty dealing with the exportation of raw and prepared opium, with the manufacture of prepared opium and internal traffic in it, and with the question of the restraint and control of the sale and use of opium in the foreign concessions in China. Nine more governments have signed this same agreement since last summer, but up to December there yet were twelve prominent countries which had refused or failed to sign this agreement, and both Great Britain and Germany were holding out against committing themselves to this policy of suppression till after the others had consented to sign. Matters seem to be at a deadlock. Even in this preliminary move there is great tardiness of action. More than this, the treaty will not be effective, even when all desired signatures are affixed, for after that it will be necessary for the representatives to fix the date on which the enforcement of the treaty shall commence. There is need of wide publicity of these facts which concern no small proportion of the human race.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Coming Convention of the Religious Education Association

The annual convention of the Religious Education Association, which will meet in New Haven, Conn., March 5–8 will make radical departures from the programs of previous conventions. Up to this time a very large number of simultaneous meetings, while providing something to suit the workers in a wide variety of fields, have been peculiarly aggravating to those whose interest is not confined to one field. Instead of many simultaneous meetings the conference will have for its general subject, "The Relation of Higher Education to the Social Order," and will consist of twelve consecutive sessions morning, afternoon, and evening of Thursday to Sunday. Because of the character of the subject to be discussed, the speakers upon the program are drawn almost exclusively from college faculties and include the names of men long familiar to the educational world. There are about twenty different colleges represented in the list, ranging from the Pacific to the Atlantic. The Commissioner of Education of the United States and the Governor of the state of Connecticut are also announced as speakers. This convention is always a notable one, and it would seem that the high-water mark would be reached in the program announced for this year.

Reading Course in Religious Education

It is appropriate to call special attention here to the reading course in religious education, the first section of which appears in another portion of this journal.

A traveling library containing all of

the books on this subject can be secured under certain conditions, by application, to the American Institute of Sacred Literature, under whose auspices the course is conducted.

City Directors of Religious Education

More and more are the churches coming to realize that the work of effectively organizing and carrying on the educational activities of the church requires time, and the attention of one who has engaged in special study of the problems of the development of the religious life, of children and young people. To the church, however, that is struggling with the question of how to raise the minister's salary and how to meet the obligations which have already been assumed in response to the call of the great denominational societies, it seems impossible to contemplate the employment of the whole of a man's time and talent for the educational work of a given church.

At least a temporary solution of the difficulty seems to appear in the action which has been taken in a number of quarters by groups of churches. For instance, in the city of Cleveland, Rev. Ernest A. Miller, a graduate of the Department of Religious Education at Boston University, has been appointed as city director of religious education for the Methodist churches. This appointment gives Mr. Miller an opportunity to make a test of the theories which he has acquired, in churches differing in type, all the way from the downtown church, with its fluctuating constituency, to the suburban church surrounded by comfortable homes. By such a plan as this a city of medium size could, with eight or ten men, secure expert direction in the religious education of all of its churches, each denomination taking care of its own group. In larger cities, churches might combine on the basis of proximity. There is always a way to solve a problem if people set earnestly to work to do so.

Instruction in Worship

The Christian world is swinging, with great force, over to the feeling of service as an expression of religion. In Sunday schools, programs of social service are being developed. In the churches the men's clubs are discussing social service. In the organizations for boys and girls the aim is service. Comparatively little attention is paid to another phase of the religious life which is quite as important, but which, because of over-emphasis in the past, is suffering from a reaction.

Children must be trained in worship if we are to retain a Sunday service and a preaching ministry. It is appalling to note the extent to which the young people drift away from attendance upon church service, and how leniently this habit is regarded by parents. It is a favorable sign that those who are interested in the scientific study of religious education are considering this matter very seriously. One of the indications of this interest is the issue of a book entitled *Worship in the Sunday School*, by Mr. Hugh Hartshorne, of Union Theological Seminary. Another favorable symptom is seen in the considerable number of ministers who are attempting definitely to meet the religious needs of the children by a preliminary sermon to the children. Others are working at programs of worship to be used with the younger children while their parents are in the main service. In some churches students of high-school age in the Sunday school are required by the schools to attend church.

It is probable that no uniform system will ever be devised, because each church presents its own local problems. The highest thing that we can hope for is that ministers shall give to the question of training the young people in worship their most serious consideration, and that they will not allow unfavorable traditions and local customs to interfere with experiments based upon modern conceptions of the needs and possibilities of the spiritual life of the children.

The Correlation of the Activities of the Church

One of the chief hindrances to the proper organization of the work of the local church is the success of the separate activities of the church. For instance, in many churches the young people's society is a very successful organization. In the same church perhaps the missionary society is successful and the woman's club a failure, the Sunday school mediocre. In other churches these conditions are reversed. In no church where a single department is pre-eminently successful does that department feel inclined to forego its pre-eminence, and unite with the other activities in such a way as to avoid duplication and give to each division its appropriate tasks and its appropriate means of expression. It is interesting to note that in some of the denominations those who have been appointed to direct the educational work of the denomination as a whole are undertaking to study this question of correlating the various educational activities of the church, and are requesting certain churches to try experiments upon the basis of which recommendations will be made to the denomination as a whole.

CHURCH EFFICIENCY

A Community Church

Mr. C. L. Cole, in the *Survey*, December 20, 1913, narrates as to what a rural community is doing socially and religiously. At one time in a community with a territory of approximately ten miles square and a population of less than seven hundred people, there were no less than twenty-four churches representing eleven denominations. Consequently much strife and contention among them were unavoidable. The main aim of each church was to enlarge its own membership. Fortunately, however, under a certain trend of circumstances, the number of these churches was decreased to three under the charge of one pastor.

Then the people saw that there must be a community church with sectarianism buried, that the gospel of Jesus Christ should dominate the community life, and that the church needs to serve the community. So the Christians of the community adopted a social program and set the young people to work under the direction of the older people. The people of the community caught the spirit, and they united themselves with the Christians to ameliorate their common community. A social center with a reading-room, a library, and a restroom was opened. Free lectures from time to time were given on health, sanitation, tuberculosis, blindness, lectures to men by physicians, on rural schools, scientific farming, to young people, etc.

Religiously the community is doing well. It has secured a pipe organ for its church. The community as a whole supports a minister to attend to its most sacred duty. The Christians belonging to different denominations are united in their efforts for the common good. The church has now three hundred sixty active co-operating workers. There is a Sunday school with more than five hundred pupils. The finances of the church are provided for by a community-budget method.

BOOK NOTICES

Extra-biblical Sources for Hebrew and Jewish History. Translated and edited by S. A. B. Mercer. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913. Pp. xvi+210. $1.50.

This book possesses one advantage over all other collections of a similar sort, in that it presents the more important inscriptions and documents from every field that bear upon the Bible. It thus includes Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Moabite, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin sources. The idea of bringing them all together into one small volume and furnishing them with brief introductory notes explaining their general bearing is a good one and worthy of encouragement.

The author tells us that he has made practically all these translations anew for himself. But we do not expect to find any significant improvement of rendering or enrichment of knowledge in the book when we read in the preface that this great task of canvassing all the important Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian inscriptions, to say nothing of the rest, and rendering them into English afresh, was taken up only two years ago. A scientific translation of all these materials would be the work of a lifetime. As a matter of fact, many words and passages in the inscriptions presented are of very doubtful meaning; but Dr. Mercer satisfies himself with repeating the renderings of his predecessors. He goes beyond them in such cases only by failing to reproduce their warnings in the way of question marks and footnotes, which call attention to the uncertainty of their renderings. The unsophisticated reader for whom this book is intended would never suspect the real state of the case.

The date of Hammurabi is to be placed at 2123–2081 B.C., rather than at 2130 or 1958 B.C. (p. 7) or 2000 B.C. (p. 193). The legend on the Black Obelisk describes Jehu as "Son of Omri" not "of the land of Omri." This legend is above the relief, as stated on p. xviii, and not beneath it, as stated on p. 33. The Dog River runs into the sea about six or seven miles to the northeast of Beirut and not "through Beirut" (p. 23). "Hamah" (p. 41) is a misprint for "Hamath." On p. 44, "Khumria" should be changed to "Omri" as is done everywhere else where the name occurs. The identification of "Eri-aku king of Larsa" with Arioch king of Ellasar (Gen., chap. 14) is not sustained "by the most competent scholars" (p. 5), but rather seriously doubted by them. The reading "Bir-idri" and its identification with Benhadad I is adhered to apparently without any suspicion that it has been shown to be practically impossible. The rendering "Bir'idri forsook his land" (p. 32) is inconsistent with the biblical statement, which is accepted on p. 25, that Hazael murdered his predecessor. It has long been recognized that this phrase, of common occurrence, denotes not flight, but death.

A second siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib is posited on p. 47, but there is no really satisfactory evidence of such a siege. The three names "Melucha," "Melukha," and "Melukhkha" on pp. 45, 48, and 55 are one and the same and should be spelled alike to save confusion in the reader's mind. On p. 61, quotation marks should accompany the first sentence.

Notwithstanding many such shortcomings as these, Dr. Mercer's book, because of the wide range of its materials and their being here so ready of access, and because of the large number of chronological and dynastic tables which it includes, will be found a very convenient work for ready reference on the part of the student of history. It is so useful a book that we can but wish it were a better one.

The Song of Songs, Edited as a Dramatic Poem, with Introduction, Revised Translation and Excursuses. By W. W. Cannon. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Pp. viii+158. *7s. 6d.*

Much discussion has gone on in recent years regarding the nature of the Song of Songs. Is it a carefully wrought-out drama; or a series of songs sung at Hebrew weddings; or a mere collection of loosely related love-songs? Mr. Cannon defends stoutly the dramatic interpretation, treating the book, however, not as a genuine drama intended for representation upon the stage, but rather as a dramatic poem intended more for scenic use. This is the most competent treatment of this view available in English. The presentation is accompanied by a keen criticism of rival views which is well worth consideration. The translation follows the Authorized Version as nearly as loyalty to the Hebrew permits. The author's textual criticism is cautious, perhaps overmuch. The text is printed with accompanying analyses and headings which enable the reader to see at a glance just what Mr. Cannon conceives the original structure and significance to have been. Footnotes accompanying the translation support it with textual and critical data. The excursuses at the end are devoted to: (1) the LXX text of the Song; (2) conjectural emendation of the Massoretic text; (3) the language of the Song; and (4) quotations from the Song in other books. Far the greater part of the volume is given up to the introduction which treats

every problem of a general character with the requisite fulness. The book is so written as to be valuable to the lay student for whom it is primarily intended, and also useful to the specialist who will find here either strong support for his own view or an attack upon it with which he must reckon.

The Theory of Social Revolutions. By Brooks Adams. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. vii+240. $1.25.

A decidedly pessimistic study, this book draws a great deal of power and significance from its appeal to a large and varied assortment of historical facts which, *per se*, nobody can gainsay. We do not agree to the partly expressed and partly implied conclusion with which Mr. Adams brings his volume to a close, namely, that America is on the eve of a drastic revolutionary settlement of the social problem which is to follow in "the infinitely extended line of impressive precedents" (p. 229). Nevertheless, we think the book is well worth attention and study. Mr. Adams is a lawyer; and his treatment of the social problem loses no force through its formulation in terms which are, to a large degree, legal. His preoccupation with jurisprudence, however, leads him to overlook certain moral aspects of history which qualify his argument and his conclusions.

His theory, in brief, is that society is a mechanism which naturally proceeds through cataclysms of adjustment to the demands generated by successive periods of evolution. As each crisis approaches, the class which is actually in power fails to recognize that the environment has changed, and so it opposes the inevitable, with the result that a new class forcibly displaces it and rises to the top. "A ruling class," writes Mr. Adams, "is seldom conscious of its own decay, and most of the worst catastrophes of history have been caused by an obstinate resistance to change when resistance was no longer possible" (p. 133). In working up to the climax of his argument, he dwells with much vividness upon the French Revolution (pp. 137–202), emphasizing that the critical moment arrived when the Parliament of Paris, representing the ancient régime, declined to register the decree of tax reform written in the name of the king by Turgot, the bourgeois minister of finance. The nobility failed to perceive that the fulness of time had come; and so they lost their estates and their heads.

In spite of his attractive style, Mr. Adams' underlying hypothesis is purely mechanical; and his estimate of the situation today is thereby vitiated. He is unduly impressed by the resemblances between revolutionary France and contemporary America, and not sufficiently influenced by the differences. The French peasantry and *bourgeoisie* were driven mad by the fact that France had no constitution through which the newer social forces could operate. America has a legal, constitutional outlet for her social awakening; and, besides, we possess a fund of conservative moral and religious force generated by our schools and churches, the like of which was absolutely non-existent in eighteenth-century France. But over and above these considerations, Mr. Adams' argument is marred by a glaring inconsistency which, of itself, is enough to falsify his conclusion. In his opening chapter, entitled "The Collapse of Capitalistic Government," he demonstrates, what every good observer knows, that the reign of unchecked capitalism in America is over. But in the concluding chapter, we find him speculating about the consequences destined to flow from the resistance of short-sighted capitalism to reform, as if our situation repeated that of France on the eve of the Revolution. Since the appearance of Mr. Adams' earlier book, *Civilization and Decay*, we have felt that he is a well informed and brilliant writer, whose judgment is not commensurate with his knowledge; and this impression is unchanged by the volume before us.

Old Testament Legends; Being Stories Out of Some of the Less-known Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament. By Mr. R. James. With 10 Illustrations by H. J. Ford. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913. Pp. xxv+157. $1.25.

This is a book for the boys and girls. It presents eight stories, chosen for their power to interest youth and for the sound sense that some of them, at least, inculcate either directly or indirectly. The translations are in some cases made by the author; in others, they are taken from standard editions of the various apocryphal books. A cleverly conceived preface furnishes the necessary viewpoint for the understanding of the stories. The collection is well fitted to arouse an interest in the Apocrypha and a desire for further knowledge of them.

Shall We Do without Jesus? By Arthur C. Hill. New York: Doran & Co., 1913. Pp. xii+304. $1.50.

The author proceeds along a line of treatment which he conceives to be more effective than that of a merely technical defense of Christian doctrine. He opposes to the negative tendencies of our time a sane and healthful message at all points where doubt or sin or agnosticism grips the present age. He admits that the church of today faces a difficult situa-

tion. Yet the past was no golden era; and the world has never yet been Christian in any deep sense of the term. Jesus is a Conqueror whose conquest goes forward; not a Monarch whose kingdom has been wrested from him. The Christian triumphs of the past are but the preluding waves of that billowing tide of victory which is to come upon men in future centuries. In this spirit, and in homiletic style, the author considers a wide range of topics on which the deliverances of Jesus go contrary to the dicta of the world. While the book is not a great book it is a worthy contribution to the newer Christian apologetic.

The Latest Light on Bible Lands. By P. S. P. Handcock. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1913. Pp. xii+371. 6*s*. net.

This volume constitutes an excellent summary of the more important results of recent excavations and discoveries in the Orient. The first five chapters follow the history of Israel through from the patriarchal age to the Maccabaean period. The next two take up the excavations in Palestine itself. One appendix summarizes the contribution of the North-Semitic inscriptions; another makes a concise statement of what is known regarding the Hittites. A splendid index, covering sixty-five pages brings together all the place-names, stating briefly what is known regarding the identification of the site in each case. The whole work forms a very useful manual which can be highly recommended to those not having time to look up the special reports and more extended monographs.

On disputed points, Handcock's judgment is usually good. For example, he hesitates to indorse the identifications of the names of Gen., chap. 14, that has been so frequently put forward with so little reason. He puts the Exodus (the last of many exoduses!) in the days of Merneptah and cites the building of Ramses and Pithom as militating against equating it with the expulsion of the Hyksos.

But he is not always a safe guide. For example, Ezra did not start to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (p. 179); this was Nehemiah's task. Jephthah's daughter was his only child; hence she probably *was* his first-born (cf. p. 228). The reading Bir-idri (p. 127) should be abandoned in favor of Adad-idri=Hadad-ezer (see D. D. Luckenbill, *Am. Jour. of Sem. Lang.*, XXVII, 267 ff.). Tiglath-pileser III (p. 139) is now known to have been in reality the *fourth* by that name. The treatment of the Ezra-Nehemiah history is too uncritical. Something should have been said about the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan and the "Conquest" for the excavations and inscriptions have greatly revised our conception of that movement. The attack upon the widely accepted equivalence of Hebrews and "Habiri" is not well sustained. An examination of the Tel-el-Amarna letters, in which the name "Habiri" appears, shows that they commonly reproduce the Hebrew sound of soft ע, as in the word עברי (=Hebrew), by the sound "ḥ" as in Ḥabiri; cf. such cases as *ḫullu* for עֹל, *ḫaparu* for עָפָר, *ḫinaja* for עִינַי. Furthermore, the LXX is by no means an infallible guide as to the sound of this guttural in Hebrew; there are many cases in which it gives the hard sound, even when the Arabic equivalent shows that the guttural was soft. Hence the phonetic objection which our author urges against the identification of the two words amounts to practically nothing. Notwithstanding such facts, the book is on the whole the best summary of the whole subject to be found in English.

Christ in the Social Order. By W. M. Clow. New York: G. H. Doran & Co., 1913. Pp. xii+295. $1.25.

The author is a professor in the United Free Church College, of Glasgow, Scotland. His purpose in writing is "to make known the will of Christ" (p. vi). The book is written very largely against those who appeal to Jesus and the New Testament on behalf of a program of socialism. Professor Clow's method is that of appealing to the same sources on behalf of a program of *non*-socialism. In doing this, he makes the same mistake of which his opponents are guilty, namely, that of going to the New Testament in search of any kind of definitive political or economic program. Socialism, in the author's estimation, is one of the chief enemies of the church; and he is particularly disturbed by the paradox of socialists who are wealthy, or who draw good salaries as Christian ministers (p. 40). All of the attempted solutions of the social problem in the past, he thinks are open to fatal objections (p. 48). He is against woman's suffrage and the taxation of land values, the two movements now in the British foreground. He favors what he calls "ethical taxation," whereby the rich pay for their luxurious position a kind of "ransom" to the poor (pp. 190 f.); and he holds that the chief means of reform is through the development of individual character (pp. 47, 69). The book is likely to strengthen the socialistic laboring man in the fallacy that the churches and theological seminaries are against him. At best, the author comes down to the people from a lofty altitude. He represents, in fact, nonconformist "high-churchism." The volume is well worth attention as a sign of the times, but scarcely because it succeeds in its ambitious aim to solve the problem of today from the standpoint of Christianity.

The New Testament Documents: Their Origin and Early History. (The Croall Lectures for 1911–12.) With twelve facsimiles. By George Milligan. London: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xvii+322. $3.50 net.

Professor Milligan of Glasgow, the commentator on Thessalonians, has succeeded in approaching the New Testament from a new angle, and in doing so has produced an interesting book. He discusses successively the original manuscripts of the New Testament, the language of its writings, their literary character, their circulation, and their collection. The whole discussion is enriched by Dr. Milligan's well-known acquaintance with the papyrus literature. While the lecture form makes the chapters interesting and readable, copious footnotes and appendices constantly reveal the evidence for Dr. Milligan's positions, and reassure the scholarly reader. The parts of the book dealing with the way in which first-century manuscripts were written and circulated, and with the contribution of the recently discovered papyrus documents to New Testament study, are especially fresh and useful. The chapters dealing with introduction and Canon are rather too summary to be wholly satisfactory, but they are suggestive, and reflect recent critical opinion. The appendices and facsimiles add much to the value of the volume.

The Text and Canon of the New Testament. (Studies in Theology.) By Alexander Souter. New York: Scribner, 1913. Pp. x+254. 75 cents.

Professor Souter of Aberdeen has recently edited the Greek text of the Revisers and supplied it with an up-to-date apparatus of readings. He now publishes a concise and intelligent sketch of the materials and methods of New Testament textual criticism, with a shorter study of the New Testament Canon. He is an adherent of Dr. Hort's critical school, and pays a merited tribute to "his almost infallible judgment" (p. 117) in textual matters. The textual sketch suffers somewhat from its brevity, and will not take the place of fuller treatments like Kenyon's and Gregory's; it is more nearly on the scale of Lake's useful little manual. Within these limits, it is excellent, and is rather more up to date than Kenyon's new edition. Von Soden's text had not appeared when Souter wrote, but his remarks upon that critic's method reflect the misgivings of a large circle of scholars, which the appearance of von Soden's text volumes has not relieved. The 60 pages given to the discussion of the Canon permits only the most summary treatment of that subject, but the addition of twenty documents important for the history of the Canon, with translations, materially increases the value of this part of the work. Useful as Professor Souter's book will be, it raises the question whether the subjects combined in it might not better have been more fully treated each in a separate volume, from his hand. The work is in general accurate, though it is hardly true that First Clement stands without Second Clement in the manuscript of the Syriac version (p. 179).

The Religious Revolution of Today. By James T. Shotwell. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913. Pp. x+162. $1.10.

Dr. Shotwell is a professor of history in Columbia University, New York City. This book is "The William Brewster Clark Memorial Lectures" for 1913, delivered at Amherst College. The purpose of the new foundation on which the lectures are given is to assist Amherst College in throwing light in a genuinely scientific spirit upon the relation of the research, discovery, and thought of today to individual attitude and social policy.

The lecturer points out, by way of preliminary, that where the world of primitive Christianity was dominated by religion, the field of religious authority and action is today steadily narrowing. The process of "secularization" is, then, the keynote of modern development. No other society is or has been so secular as ours. Religion, however, is not growing less in itself, but less in relation to other things which are crowding to the front. It is mainly around this fact that the religious problem of today revolves. In order to work this problem out effectively, more cordial relations must be cultivated between the religious and the social sciences. The older, dogmatic, theological studies have warned sociology off their territory. On the other hand, the social sciences have not fully grasped the significance and evolution of the largest factor in social history.

Religion is the reaction of mankind to something apprehended but not comprehended. The constant elements in the situation are mystery and emotion. Today we have a lessening of the emotional appreciation of mystery and a strengthening of the curiosity which leads toward real knowledge. Curiosity, hitherto, has been secondary and neglected but now it claims the lead. Science is building up a new world of rationality. Since the intellect is getting control, there must be a religion of the head as well as of the heart. And as we now see in life itself the mystery which we used to see only in death, so long as life endures the note of reverence will sound through the mind. But the tone of that reverence will be molded by our new, scientific environment instead of by the old, imaginary environment of our forefathers.

English Monasteries. ("Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.") By A. Hamilton Thompson. Cambridge: University Press; (New York: Putnam), 1913. Pp. 156. $1.40.

Within the limits of a small manual, Mr. Thompson has produced an interesting account of the rise of the religious orders, their coming to England, the types of building in which they were housed there, and the manner of life they followed. While his chief aim has been to describe the typical conventual buildings of the English monasteries, historical and social aspects are briefly treated. Well-selected plans and illustrations add much to the usefulness of the book. The subject has an added interest because these conventual groups of buildings were the parents of the English college groups, in which dorter, cloister, frater, and church reappear. The book is intelligently and sympathetically written. There is a select bibliography and an index.

The Three Religions of China. By W. E. Soothill. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913. Pp. xii+324. $1.50.

The author was principal of the Shansi Imperial Chinese University; and he has lived in China for thirty years. The lectures here published were delivered in Oxford University under the auspices of the Board for the Training of Missionaries, established by the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference. The material is intended primarily for the use of students going out from Christian lands to work in China. It will also be of good service to the general reader, and to the student of comparative religion. The book consists of twelve lectures, beginning with an introductory discourse on the "three religions." The following lecture deals with Confucius and his School; the third, with Taoism; the fourth, with Buddha and Buddhism. The remaining lectures treat the idea of God; man's relationship with, and approach to, the divine; ideas about the system of the universe; the soul, ancestor-worship, and the future life; moral ideas; sin and its consequences in life and character; public and private religion. The book is an instructive and scholarly work which ought to find a place in the growing western literature on this great eastern people.

Two volumes of present-day Anglican sermons come to us from London. One is *Antichrist and Other Sermons*, by Dr. John M. Figgis, of Cambridge (Longmans, $1.60); the other is *Repton School Sermons*, by Dr. William Temple, of Oxford, the head-master of Repton (Macmillan, $1.25). We are always glad to know what our brethren of the Establishment are saying. Both collections evince a deep spirituality and a firm hold on the faith. And both show how hard it is becoming for ministers who are in the full stream of tradition to avoid the influence of the newer social forces and issues. Dr. Temple refers again and again to the social problem (pp. 13, 31, 44, 63, 64, 75, 260, etc.); and while he declares that he has faith in the future, yet he says: "We cannot see any solution, and there are no great men to teach us. We see the need, but not the way to meet it. Our national development has been so great and so triumphant—the pattern of Europe; and it ends in an *impasse*. We see not our own tokens; there is not one prophet more; not one among us is there that understandeth any more. The people who call themselves progressive are depressed and anxious. The people who think the present order, however faulty, better than any alternative they know, are still more depressed as the forces of change continue their ceaseless operation." The volume by Dr. Figgis is even more outspoken, and a trifle more theological. This preacher confronts the whole situation, doctrinal and social, in an actively warlike mood. In his opinion, the entire structure of the old, evangelical orthodoxy (which he interprets to embrace a high view of the Eucharist) is threatened by modern criticism (pp. 24–32). The idea that the clergy, as a matter of course, should be enlisted on the side of conscienceless property is false to Christianity (p. 251); yet denial of the old *noblesse oblige* aristocracy is unChristian (p. 136). But the investing classes will have to be content with less than in the past (p. 193). The House of Commons consists mostly of plutocratic mediocrities (p. 45). This material is very interesting and significant. If it is at all representative, we can discern at least a part of the reason for that scarcity in leadership which one of our authors laments in such plaintive terms.

A number of additions have been recently made to the "Short Course Series" (Scribner, 50 cents each). Professors J. E. McFadyen, W. G. Jordan, and James Stalker are among the more widely known of those who have previously contributed to the series. Homiletical suggestiveness and spiritual atmosphere mark the new volumes equally with the earlier ones. Rev. Dr. D. J. Burrell gives a practical exposition of John, chaps. 13–17, under the title *In the Upper Room*. Canon Vaughn, of Winchester, is the author of short studies in the Psalter, entitled *A Mirror of the Soul*. Professor Adam C. Welch, of the Old Testament Department in New College, Edinburgh, writes on *The Story of Joseph*. Rev. Dr. C. F. Aked, of San Francisco, supplies a volume on *The Divine Drama of Job*. Each of these books has an appendix of information about additional reading on the subject in hand.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. VI

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

This course is published in ten leaflets issued on the fifteenth of each month from September, 1913, to June, 1914. It is sent free to all members of the AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE *enrolling for this course. Membership in the* INSTITUTE *may be secured by sending the annual membership fee of fifty cents and four cents for postage to the headquarters of the* INSTITUTE, *at the University of Chicago.*

STUDY V (*Continued*)

CHAPTER X

CHURCH LITERATURE REFLECTING THE CONVICTION THAT CHRISTIANITY IS A WORLD RELIGION

Within two or three decades after the death of Jesus, his followers were to be found spreading the message, which they had caught from him, far out into the non-Jewish world. The letters of Paul occasionally refer to the gospel of Christ as a faith adapted to all peoples (Rom. 1:16; 10:12; 11:11*b*, 12, 25*b*); and the apostle counted it his great life-mission to work chiefly among Gentiles (Gal.1: 15–16*a*), his extant letters being directed to them alone. Mark, also, seems to be writing for his adopted brethren at Rome, and his gospel here and there sounds the universal note (12:9; 13:10; 16:15). But "the Gospel according to Matthew" represents a still more advanced stage of church-consciousness: its author has seemingly arranged all his material with this one main end in view, namely, to show the worldwide scope of the religion of Jesus.

It is now generally conceded that this gospel is later than Mark and there is much reason to think that it is called after the name of Jesus' publican-disciple, because "sayings of Jesus," gathered by Matthew about 60 A.D., were used as one of the important sources of the present book. The author's familiarity with the geography of Palestine; with Jewish history, customs, sects, and ideas; and his attitude toward the Old Testament, indicate that he was a Jew but (as other evidence shows) a liberal Christian Jew, thoroughly persuaded of Jesus' messiahship and universal saviorhood. Is he seeking to win his brother-Jews to his broader faith? Is he showing the church of his day how and why this religion of Jesus broke the bounds of formal Judaism and became a world-faith? Is he, in a time of great crisis, trying to hold Jewish Christians faithful to Jesus Christ, even urging them to abandon the Judaism in which both he and they were brought up,

for a deeper consecration to this gospel of Christ which is sweeping over the whole world with divine power? Probably chiefly the last. In any case, one feels the breadth and passion of a real master-mind bent upon the one all-important end: the presentation of Jesus as the world's Savior.

In using Mark as one of his main sources, the author quotes nearly all of it, follows its main narrative-outline, frequently abbreviates and changes the location of its material, and occasionally seeks to improve it, especially by correcting what he deems may convey harmful and unworthy impressions of Jesus. Having just read Mark, we shall in Matthew give special attention to new material which our author presents for study.

The following is an attempt to exhibit the plan of the book as it lay in the writer's mind:

ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

I. The Birth and Infancy of Jesus:
The Advent of the Messiah in Accordance with Prophecy (chaps. 1, 2).
1. The genealogy of Jesus, showing his Abrahamic and Davidic descent (1:1–17).
2. The annunciation to Joseph, and the birth of Jesus from the virgin, as prophesied (1:18–25).
3. The visit of the Magi, giving occasion to the testimony of the Jewish doctors that Bethlehem was the prophesied birthplace of the Messiah (2:1–12).
4. The flight into Egypt, fulfilling prophecy (2:13–15).
5. The murder of the children of Bethlehem, fulfilling prophecy (2:16–18).
6. The return from Egypt and removal to Nazareth, fulfilling prophecy (2:19–23).

II. Preparation for the Public Work of Jesus:
Events preparatory to the founding of the kingdom (3:1—4:11).
1. The preparatory ministry of John the Baptist, in accordance with prophecy (3:1–12).
2. The baptism of Jesus, accompanied by the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven (3:13–17).
3. The temptation in the wilderness, settling the principles on which his work was to be done (4:1–11).

III. The Ministry in Galilee:
The kingdom founded and its fundamental principles set forth (4:12—18:35).
1. The beginning of Jesus' work in Galilee (4:12–25).
   a) The removal to Capernaum and the beginning of preaching (4:12–17).
   b) The call of the Four to evangelistic work (4:18–22).
   c) Jesus' early work in Galilee; his widespread fame (4:23–25).
2. The Sermon on the Mount;[1] the ethical principles of the kingdom (chaps. 5–7).
3. A group of events, each of which either illustrates or attests the authority which in the sermon he has assumed (8:1—9:34).

[1] It is worthy of notice that each alternate section of this Part III (see 2, 4, 6, 8) is a discourse of Jesus: all these discourses treat of the kingdom of heaven, and together constitute an exposition of the kingdom in its various phases.

a) A leper cleansed (8:1–4).
b) The centurion's servant healed (8:5–13).
c) Peter's wife's mother healed (8:14–18).
d) Answers to disciples about following him (8:19–22).
e) The stilling of the tempest (8:23–27).
f) The Gadarene demoniacs (8:28–34).
g) A paralytic healed and his sins forgiven (note here the relation implied between power and authority) (9:1–8).
h) The call of Matthew (9:9–13).
i) Answer concerning fasting (9:14–17).
j) A ruler's daughter raised, and a woman healed (9:18–26).
k) Two blind men and a dumb demoniac healed (9:27–34).

4. Discourse to the Twelve on sending them out; the proclamation of the kingdom (9:35—10:42).
5. Events showing the attitude of various persons toward the gospel, and teaching concerning the spirit in which the gospel must be received (chaps. 11, 12).
   a) Jesus' answer to the message from John the Baptist (11:1–6).
   b) The captious spirit of the Jews condemned by Jesus (11:7–19).
   c) Woes against the cities which had not repented at the preaching of Jesus (11:20–24).
   d) The thanksgiving of Jesus that the gospel is plain to the simple-minded, and his invitation to the heavy-laden (11:25–30).
   e) Plucking grain on the Sabbath; the bigotry of the Pharisees rebuked (12:1–8).
   f) Healing of the withered hand on the Sabbath; bigotry issuing in murderous purpose (12:9–14).
   g) Jesus heals many; the gentleness of his ministry (12:15–21).
   h) Jesus heals a blind and dumb demoniac; the Pharisees charge him with collusion with Satan, and Jesus warns them of the danger of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (12:22–37).
   i) The Pharisees seek a sign; Jesus' answer (12:38–42).
   j) The man from whom the unclean spirit has gone out; a parable of the Jewish nation (12:43–45).
   k) The real basis of relationship to Christ (12:46–50).
6. Discourse of parables, chiefly concerning the growth of the kingdom (13:1–52).
7. The events of the later part of the Galilean ministry, illustrating especially the increasing unbelief and opposition of the Pharisees, and the instruction of the disciples, particularly from 16:21 on, in preparation for his death (13:53—17:27).
   a) The unbelief of the Nazarenes (13:53–58).
   b) The death of John the Baptist at the hands of Herod (14:1–12).
   c) The feeding of the five thousand (14:13–22).
   d) Jesus walking on the water, and Peter's attempt to do so (14:23–36).
   e) Eating with unwashen hands; the Pharisees' criticism, and Jesus' answer (15:1–20).

f) The faith of a Canaanitish woman (15:21–28).
g) A multitude healed by the Sea of Galilee (15:29–31).
h) The feeding of the four thousand (15:32–39).
i) Pharisees and Sadducees demand a sign; Jesus' answer (16:1–4).
j) The leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees; Jesus' warning and the slowness of the disciples to understand (16:5–12).
k) Peter's confession of Jesus as the Messiah (16:13–20).
l) Jesus begins to instruct his disciples concerning his death and resurrection (16:21–28).
m) The transfiguration, wherein Jesus is declared to be the Son of God (17:1–13).
n) The epileptic boy healed (17:14–20).
o) Jesus again foretells his death (17:22, 23).
p) The payment of the temple tax and Jesus' instruction of Peter concerning relation to the temple worship (17:24–27).

8. Discourse on ambition, humility, and forgiveness; the personal relations of the citizens of the kingdom to one another (chap. 18).

IV. Journey through Perea to Jerusalem:
Jesus continues the instruction of his disciples, especially in the latter part, concerning his death (chaps. 19, 20).

1. The departure from Galilee (19:1, 2).
2. Answer to questions concerning divorce (19:3–12).
3. Christ blesses little children, and reproves his disciples (19:13–15).
4. Answer to the rich young man concerning eternal life (19:16–22).
5. Instruction to the disciples concerning riches as an obstacle to entrance into the kingdom (19:23–26).
6. Concerning the rewards of discipleship (19:27—20:16).
7. Jesus foretells his crucifixion (20:17–19).
8. The ambition of James and John, and Jesus' answer concerning suffering and rewards in his service (20:20–28).
9. The two blind men near Jericho, who hail Jesus as son of David (20:29–34).

V. The Closing Ministry in Jerusalem (Passion week):
The last offer of the Messiah to the nation and the final rejection (chaps. 21–27).

1. Symbolic proclamation of himself as the Messiah (21:1–17).
   a) The triumphal entry (21:1–11).
   b) The cleansing of the temple (21:12–17).
2. Symbolic prediction to the disciples of the rejection of the nation (21:18–22).
3. The mutual rejection. The Jews resist the claim of Jesus; he reiterates warning and prediction (21:23—23:39).
   a) The Jews' challenge of his authority to cleanse the temple, and his answer to them (21:23–27).
   b) Three parables of warning (21:28—22:14).
      i) The parable of the Two Sons (21:28–32).
      ii) The parable of the Husbandmen, predicting the rejection of the nation (21:33–46).
      iii) The parable of the Marriage of the King's Son (22:1–14).

c) Three questions by the Jewish rulers (22:15–40).
i) Concerning paying tribute (22:15–22).
ii) Concerning the resurrection (22:23–33).
iii) Concerning the greatest commandment (22:34–40).
d) Jesus' question concerning the Christ (22:41–46).
e) Jesus' great discourse against the Pharisees (chap. 23).

4. Prophetic discourse to the disciples concerning the end of the nation and the end of the age (chaps. 24, 25).
5. Preparation for the death of Jesus (26:1–46).
a) By his enemies; the plot to put him to death (26:1–5).
b) By his friends; the anointing (26:6–13).
c) By Judas; the bargain to betray him (26:14–16).
d) By Jesus himself (26:17–46).
i) The last supper (26:17–30).
ii) The warning to the disciples (26:31–35).
iii) The prayer and the agony (26:36–46).
6. The consummation of the rejection of Jesus by the Jews (26:47—27:66).
a) The arrest (26:47–56).
b) The trial (26:57—27:31).
c) The crucifixion and the death (27:32–56).
d) The burial (27:57–61).
e) The watch at the tomb (27:62–66).

VI. The Appearances of Jesus after the Resurrection:
The triumph of the Messiah over his enemies and the commission of the disciples to win all nations to him (chap. 28).
1. The appearance on the resurrection morning (28:1–10).
2. The report of the watch; attempt of the Jews to suppress the evidence (28:11–15).
3. The appearance in Galilee; the commission of the disciples (28:16–20).

Seventeenth day.—§ 49. *Added proofs of the messiahship of Jesus, drawn from traditions of his royal lineage and of the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies:* Matt., chaps. 1, 2. Study, with care, 1:1–17, noting: formal arrangement of this genealogy and the use of the multiple of seven; with what names the list begins and ends; the names of the five women mentioned (recall the history of the first four). What purpose does such a genealogy ordinarily serve? How is it used by this author to reflect honor upon Jesus? Read vss. 18–25. How, according to vss. 18*b* and 20*b*, did the later church explain the uniqueness of Jesus' character? Lest this story might lead to slander and misunderstanding (as it actually did among certain of the non-Christian Jews), what guaranty of purity was given to Jesus' birth (vss. 19, 20, 24, 25*a*)? Note the twofold annunciation of Jesus' sacred mission: at the lips of one of the most notable of the prophets (vss. 22, 23; cf. Isa. 7:14, and read the context carefully); the burning words of an angelic messenger direct from God out of heaven (vss. 20, 21). How was the church accustomed to receive such testimony? Could anything be more satisfactory or final?

Read 2:1–12, asking yourself the following questions: How would the fact of Jesus' birth at Bethlehem tend to confirm his messiahship (vss. 1, 5*a*)? How did the New Testament writers quote Old Testament passages—with the context in

mind, or detached statements complete in themselves (cf. Mic., chap. 5)? What does it signify in relation to the author's purpose that Gentiles go to great trouble over the new Jewish King, while the religious leaders appear quite unaware of the great event occurring in their very midst (vss. 1–4), and the Jewish ruler seeks his life? Is it by accident that Joseph takes his family to the new home of Nazareth, or is he carefully directed thither by the Lord (vss. 19–23*a*), unconsciously fulfilling some vague but divinely intended Scripture (vs. 23*b*)?

Eighteenth day.—§ 50. *More complete and striking accounts than Mark's of the preparation for Jesus' ministry:* Matt. 3:1—4:11. Notice, in reading 3:1–6, how our author, in using Mark's narrative for the framework of his own account, yet handles it freely to make such changes as his own views and special sources suggest are wise and necessary. Notice also that the author now inserts a passage not found in Mark, but probably from another written gospel, since the author of Luke also quotes it practically word for word. Notice the vividness and strength of conception expressed in these vss. 7–10: an uncultured rural preacher daring to denounce the motives of the great churchmen of Jerusalem, and in such stinging terms (vss. 7–8)! Does not Jewish blood count so much then, after all; and can better "children of God" be found elsewhere (vs. 9)? "What, the national piety in danger of destruction, and at the hand of God, the God of our fathers!" say these representatives of the Jewish church (vs. 10). Does this passage further our author's main purpose? Again in vs. 12 (after touching Mark again, for a moment, in vs. 11), what kind of a Christ is needed by the times ("baptize with fire . . . . fan . . . . cleanse . . . . gather . . . . chaff . . . . burn . . . . unquenchable!")? Does this explain why in the author's day the Jews have not largely accepted Jesus as the Christ?

Would you judge, from Matt. 3:14, 15 (not found in Mark), that John certainly recognized Jesus as his superior, the Christ? And what does our author mply as to Jesus' thought about himself (vs. 15)? Note the many little changes made in Mark's account (Matt. 3:13, 16, 17. Cf. Mark 1:12, 13). Does the multitude hear God's voice, publicly announcing Jesus' messiahship? After other minor but significant changes in Mark's narrative of the Temptation (Matt. 4:1–2, 11), the author again quotes from the source that he shares with Luke. What is his viewpoint here (read 4:3–11) regarding: Jesus' consciousness of new power (vss. 3*a*, 6*a*)? Jesus' ability to do unheard-of wonders (vss. 3*b*, 6*b*, 8*b*)? Jesus' absolute and unshakable devotion to the will of God (vss. 4, 7, 10)? The ceaseless interest of all heaven in all that befell Jesus (vs. 11*b*)? Does the author now regard Jesus as ready for any future test of messiahship?

Nineteenth day.—§ 51. *Jesus' successful beginning in Galilee:* Matt. 4:12—5:48. Again (Matt. 4:13–17) the author explains Mark's statement about Jesus' removal to Capernaum (Mark 1:14) by saying that God had so ordered it long ago in prophecy. He cannot feel, with Mark (1:21—34, 35–38, 45), that Jesus cared for recognition of his messiahship from people who were under the devil's power; or that Jesus ever shrank from publicity as a healer. Healing, to this author, was one of the prime elements in Jesus' divine work (4:23–25).

Just here our author inserts, in Mark's outline, three whole chapters (5–7) of Jesus' teachings, taken from other written sources. Read chap. 5 as excerpts from many of Jesus' public addresses and from his private talks to the twelve. Real-

izing the fervor and conviction with which these words were uttered, make a careful list of the leading characteristics which Jesus sought so patiently to cultivate in his little circle of friends. Note the positive, aggressive spirit expressed in these concise sayings. How did these convictions grow out of Jesus' experience? Does vs. 48 suggest the keynote of the Master's life, and the secret of his marvelous development?

Twentieth day.—§ 52. *Requirements for discipleship:* Matt. 5–7. Work through chaps. 6 and 7 in the same way, asking: (1) Did Jesus actually live out this principle? (2) Just what is it that he asks of those who count themselves his followers? Complete your list of Christian characteristics as given in chaps. 5–7.

Twenty-first day.—§ 53. *Illustrations of Jesus' power and authority:* Matt., chaps. 8, 9. After abbreviating Mark's leper-story (Mark 1:40–45), our author draws again upon a written source used also by Luke. Read chaps. 8 and 9 and notice how each of these sections, brought together from various sources, is used to illustrate the thought of Jesus' authority with which chap. 7 ends; and especially the thought that power in deed argues authority in teaching (9:6). Was it important for the author's purpose to impress this thought, and would the argument from miracle appeal to the author's Jewish-Christian readers?

Twenty-second day.—§ 54. *On how to preach the gospel: varying results:* Matt. 10:1—11:1 and 11:2–30. Compare Mark 6:7–13 and observe that several new notes are struck in the additional sayings: (*a*) a restricted mission (vss. 5–7); (*b*) new powers given to the Twelve (vs. 8); (*c*) graver dangers to be met in the journey (vss. 15–22); in Mark, chap. 13, these troubles are placed in the future; (*d*) the return of Jesus as Messiah from heaven before the tour is finished (vs. 23); (*e*) most strenuous pleas for personal loyalty to the Master until they meet him again in the final judgment (vss. 24–42). Has our author forgotten that many of these sayings could hardly have fitted the earlier times in Galilee? Is he thinking more of the needs of Christian evangelists in his own day when men had to face persecution and death, and needed to be assured that Jesus would some day return from heaven to reward them for faithful service to his cause, than of Jesus' own time? (Cf. vss. 28, 32–39.)

Read 11:2–30. In spite of all Jesus' warnings and pleas for recognition and loyalty on the part of his Jewish people, the author of this gospel knows his people have failed to respond. Even John the Baptist's testimony and loyalty have not moved them (read 11:2–15). Nothing but childish complaint has come in response. Both John and Jesus make no impression upon a hardened people (vss. 16–19)! Nothing but doom can befall such a heartless nation (vss. 20–24)! But the author shares his Master's gratitude that some Jews, though it be but comparatively few, have seen the great revelation of truth, and have found rest of soul, in the Christ (vss. 25–30).

Twenty-third day.—§ 55. *The importance of welcoming the gospel:* Matt. 12:1—13:52. For some time now our author follows Mark's lead; yet we find him frequently adding editorial touches of his own, or calling in pertinent material from the other documents he is using. He voices the following church beliefs: (*a*) Christ supersedes both temple and Sabbath (the most sacred of Jewish institutions). Read 12:6, 8. (*b*) He seeks privacy, not to avoid miracle fame (as in Mark), but to fulfil Isaiah's word as to his humility and gentleness (vss. 16–21).

Notice the use of the word "gentiles" in the quotation. What does this reference mean to the author? (*c*) Why does he omit all reference to Mark 3:20–21? Would the quotation of such a statement hurt his cause? (*d*) Note what emphasis the church laid upon the resurrection of Christ: a sufficient sign; proving him greater than even the greatest men of Old Testament days (vss. 38–42). (*e*) How had the Jewish people refused to accept purification at Christ's hands, only to fall back into greater degradation and utter doom (vss. 43–45; also 13:12, 14, 15, 24–30)? (*f*) The ultimate spread of the gospel power (vs. 33). (*g*) The final destruction of all who reject the Christ (vss. 36–43, 47–50). (*h*) The kingdom requires a man's utter devotion (vss. 44–45).

Twenty-fourth day.—§ 56. *Increasing opposition:* Matt. 13:53—15:39. Mark's tradition of Jesus' rejection at the hands of his own fellow-townsmen is next emphasized (Matt. 13:54–58); and a little later Jesus' grief over the heartless murder of John is recalled (Matt. 14:13). In 14:28–33, note the absolute faith of the church in Jesus' almighty power, and therefore in his divine origin. Accepting Mark's story of the final break with the Pharisaic officials who had come north to attack him (15:1–11), the author adds Jesus' prophetic words to the disciples (vss. 12–14). What do they signify in the light of this writer's purpose? Study vss. 21–28, finding again the conviction that Jesus' original mission was strictly Jewish, but that gentile faith at times put the Jews to shame, foreshadowing the time when the Gentiles would have full share in the gospel. What tendency, common in this gospel, do we find in vss. 29–31? (Cf. Mark 7:33; 8:23.)

Twenty-fifth day.—§ 57. *The Christ revealed:* Matt. 16:1—18:35. Study carefully Matt. 16:13–20, noting the fact that vss. 16*b*–19 are a peculiarly Matthean addition to Mark's story of this event. In what light does the author regard: (*a*) Peter (vss. 16*a*, 18–19; cf. Matt. 14:29)? (*b*) The discovery that Jesus is actually more than their teacher and friend (vs. 17)? (*c*) The future of the church (vs. 18*b*)? Why does Jesus wish his Messiahship—now for the first time clearly understood—kept so secret (vs. 20; cf. 17:9)? Read Matt. 16: 21–28 (mostly taken from Mark). How minutely was Jesus believed to have known the details of his coming suffering? What must Jesus' heroic attitude and appeal for loyalty have meant to the author's readers? Note, in 17:24–27, the third story given by this writer concerning Peter's place of leadership among Jesus' followers (cf. 14:28–32; 16:16–19). How did the later church regard Peter? Does this passage help to account for it? How does Mark read at this point? With what mingled tenderness and sternness the followers of Christ are mentioned (18:6–7, 10, 12–14)! Do vss. 15–17 show that Jesus planned for a church; or is this the spirit of later church discipline attached to some of Jesus' sayings? Do vss. 18–20 endanger Peter's primacy (cf. 16:18–19), or do they suggest the new sense of power in the lives of all Christians of that time? How the author emphasizes the need of the forgiving spirit (vss. 21–35)!

Twenty-sixth day.—§ 58. *The Christ publicly announced:* Matt. 19:1—21:27. Read Matt. 19:10–12, 28, recalling how often our author sounds the double note of sacrifice and reward. Does 20:1–16 (in this gospel only) suggest once again the author's viewpoint—the Gentiles having precedence in the kingdom of God? He finds, also, in the triumphal entry (21:1–10), a specific fulfilment of prophecy; even in details Jesus is following the prearranged divine plan. The crowds, and even

innocent little children, all spontaneously recognize Jesus' prophetic and messianic dignity (21:11–16), and Jesus concedes as much and rebukes the officials for their dulness of vision (vs. 16*b*). Then, with pathetic weariness of heart, prophetic of the coming national bereavement, Jesus "leaves them" (vs. 17).

Twenty-seventh day.—§ 59. *Christ's arraignment of the Jewish leaders:* Matt. 21:28—22:14. In the three parables which follow (the first found only in this gospel, the second taken from Mark, the third from the gospel writing which Matthew and Luke used in common), how is the coming doom of Israel clearly emphasized (read 21:28–32, 33–44; 22:1–14)? How did these plain warnings affect the church leaders of that time (21:45–46; 22:15)? In his final and tremendous arraignment of these false leaders of the people, what doom is pronounced (chap. 23)? Is Matt. 24:28 (taken from one of the sources used also by Luke) a picture of the final condition of the nation? What bearing has this on the purpose of the book? Is all this a step toward, and an explanation of, the rejection of the Jews?

Twenty-eighth day.—§ 60. *National doom pronounced:* Matt. 22:15—25:46. Read now the remarkable and closing group of parables not found in Mark: 24:37–44, 45–51; 25:1–13, 14–30, 31–46. What an appeal to loyalty both in Jesus' day and in the days of the author! And what an awful doom, either for a nation or an individual, who persistently turned away from God's chosen Son!

Twenty-ninth day.—§ 61. *The Christ rejected by the Jewish leaders:* Matt. 26:1—27:66. Here follows the story of Jesus' betrayal, capture, and crucifixion —nearly all taken from Mark's story. Notable incidents, added from the gospel writing used by Matthew only, are as follows: (*a*) a Peter-story (?) (26:51–54); (*b*) a Judas-story (27:3–10); (*c*) the dream of Pilate's wife (vs. 19); (*d*) the guilty nation (vss. 24–25); (*e*) ridicule of Jesus' messianic claim (vs. 43); (*f*) remarkable occurrences at the death of Jesus (vss. 51*b*–54*a*); (*g*) the guard at the tomb (vss. 62–66). Study the significance of these narratives from the viewpoint of the author and of the church of those days.

Thirtieth day.—§ 62. *The vindication of Jesus' messiahship, and the basis of a world-wide gospel:* Matt. 28:1–20. To material derived from Mark the author adds some evidently from other sources. Why does he include vss. 11–15? Consider how they would further the end he had in view. But notice especially vss. 18–20 (perhaps derived from Mark in its original form), and consider how they fit into his purpose. To whom does the Christ, who once told his disciples to go only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (10:16), now send them? Why this change? (Cf. 21, 43.) Is the gospel then for the Jews only or for *all* nations? Think back now, with the aid of your notes and the analysis, and ask once again: Has the author carried out his purpose, satisfactorily to that day, and to ours?

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

Volume XLIII MARCH 1914 Number 3

THE SOCIAL OPTIMISM OF FAITH IN A DIVINE JESUS

The deity of Christ is not a matter of widespread discussion among sociologists! "Modern men" regard the matter as one of those highly metaphysical, impractical questions which used to be discussed several hundred years ago. As it cannot be reduced to statistics they pass it by.

Even among theologians the deity of Christ is often treated as a sort of shibboleth. The man who believes in it is orthodox and the man who does not believe in it is not orthodox. What easier way of labeling people could there be?

Even when a modern evangelical body draws up its creed it expresses itself so euphemistically as not to hurt anybody's theological feelings.

Suppose, however, we take the matter out from the region of philosophy and put it into the region of religion. That will save us from barren word-struggles.

There is an easy question by which one can test his attitude toward Jesus: Do I really believe that he is able to save the world —not merely rescue men from the world?

Rescue is not Christ's program. God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world but that the world through him might be saved. Do those who insist upon the metaphysical deity of Christ really believe that?

A boy may rescue a child from a flood, but he cannot save the neighborhood from being inundated. Many Christians seem to have no more confidence in the power of Jesus than that. Society is hopeless even for Jesus. God must burn up civilization before Jesus can establish here a new social order. Is not that to doubt

the deity of Christ? The only way for God to save the world is to transform it into the Kingdom of God. If Jesus has not the power to do this, he may be an excellent speculator on social questions and individual morals, but it is idle to speak of his Deity. The world has beaten him. At the best in the place of a triumphant spirituality we have the triumph of material forces, fire and earthquake.

Can any intelligent person believe that that is the way God works in the realm of human affairs? Look at our social situation frankly and truthfully. Can it be transformed by the power of brute force? They that draw the sword shall perish by the sword. A God who is a spirit cannot rely upon any but spiritual forces to save spiritual values. The only salvation possible is a spiritual regeneration. That is the heart of the gospel.

If a man believes that the gospel of Jesus Christ is capable of producing this spiritual change in human affairs, he has set to his seal that he believes not only in God but in God personally revealed in Jesus. He may be confused about the metaphysics of the process of this revelation, but he does something more than merely assent to formulas drawn up by people who have been dead many hundred years.

He trusts in the power of his Master.

Instead of merely believing something *about* Jesus, however important that may be, he believes *in* Jesus. He believes that the world can be saved because the power exercised by Jesus is the divine power—"the finger of God" as Jesus says—and that the program of Christianity is not superimposed upon the world by priests and theologians, but that it grows up out of a divine mind forever active and spiritually supreme. He sees new meaning in every expression of the New Testament which testifies to the superhuman power of his Master.

Inevitably he shares in the optimism and courage of his Master.

That is the sort of evangelicalism the world needs—not a hair-splitting, definition-making, shibboleth-constructing, label-attaching ecclesiasticalism, but a supreme confidence in Jesus as the One through whom God is actually at work in our world. And therefore he must win. Through him and all that he teaches, society can be transformed into the Kingdom of God.

THE CHURCH AND THE PRESENT-DAY LABOR STRUGGLE

J. E. WILLIAMS
Streator, Illinois

Mr. Williams is one of the most representative men in the field of industrial arbitration. He is the financial arbitrator of the United Mine Workers of America No. 12, and of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association. He is also chairman of the Board of Arbitration of Hart, Schaffner & Marx and their Garment Workers' Union. He is a member of the Illinois State Mining Investigation Commission, and was vice-chairman of the Cherry Commission. In addition to these activities he is chairman of the Sunday Evening Course given regularly in Streator, and is president of the Illinois Unitarian Conference.

It is not probable that all of our readers will agree with all of Mr. Williams' opinions, particularly in some of his incidental statements, but we most earnestly commend the careful reading of his article by anyone who wishes to understand the present situation in the labor world and to gain an intelligent idea as to what part the church can actually take in the labor struggle.

What is the present-day labor struggle?

In its essence it is a struggle for power. In the past the power has been in the hands of the employer. In the future it is going to be in the hands of the laborer. Today we are in the midst of the struggle over the transfer. Labor demands more power: capital refuses to part with it. Conflict inevitably ensues and when the fight is over it is found that labor has advanced—if not directly in power, at least in that hunger for power which is sure of realization later.

In my town last spring a small group of public service employees struck against a giant corporation. They struck not for more wages, but for the recognition of their union. Some of their leaders asked me if they were not right in striking for so great a cause. I replied: "It is not a question of right but of might. No employer will recognize a union because he wants to; but only because he has to. As it is he has all the power in his own hands. When he recognizes your union he divides his power with you. He won't do it if he can help it."

There was trial of strength and the men lost. They went back to work without recognition of their union. But let it not be imagined that defeat diminished the craving which caused the strike. It only deepened the sense of injustice, only whetted the hunger for a share of that power which the conviction of the age has declared to be the workman's right. When the propitious time comes that hunger will express itself again, there will be another strike, and the next time the issue may be different.

The Struggle in the Garment Industry

I spent three months of last summer trying to adjust the balance of power in a large and complicated industry. Rather than face a long and possibly disastrous strike the employers had consented to share a portion of their power with the workers. Here again it was not a question of wages, but of recognition of the union in its extreme form, that is, in the form of the "closed shop." Rather than part with as much power as was implied in the "closed shop" the company at first was ready to fight, but the matter was compromised on the basis of the "preferential" shop. The degree of "preference" to be granted was to be left to a board of arbitration, of which I was chairman. In listening to the arguments I found that "preference" was only a synonym for power, and that I was umpire in a contest which involved a transfer of power from the employer to the laborer. The employer in this case was more than usually liberal, progressive, and desirous of establishing sympathetic and co-operative relations with the workers; the labor leaders were intelligent, constructive, idealistic, and without a thought or an interest that was not devoted to the well-being of their comrades.

Yet despite the evident intelligence and sincerity on both sides they could not for a long time be brought to agree on a division of power. The company urged with great persistence and earnestness that to grant the workers' demands would lower the quality of work, weaken shop discipline, increase cost of production, and probably cripple or destroy the business. The labor leaders with equal emphasis insisted that without increased power they would be unable to protect their membership against discrimination, oppression, and exactions of various kinds that would reduce their earning power. They scorned the assurances of the company that they would be treated justly and generously, and demanded that they be placed in a position where they would not be dependent on the generous moods or sentiments of the company.

No one could listen to the arguments without being convinced that both sides were potentially right. No doubt the employers had oppressed the workers in the past and might do so again. No doubt the transfer of power asked by the labor leaders might enable them to wreck the business if they used it recklessly or unwisely.

How could the leaders be trusted?

They were at the head of several thousand workers, mostly composed of new immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe—Russian Jews, Lithuanians, Roumanians, Poles, Italians, and the like. The leaders were themselves strangers who had hardly mastered the language—only six or eight years from a land where factories and trade unions were unknown.

Were the fears of the employers unfounded? By no means. They had a right to dread the passing of power from the hands of their trusted foremen and superintendents to those of these new recruits in our industrial army. What havoc they might cause in a highly complicated and delicately balanced organization might well give rise to profound misgivings. It was no arrogant vaunt of "running their own business" that made the employers

pause. They had long passed that point, and no longer stood out for individualistic control. But to transfer to the union power over hiring and discharge, over the balancing of sections, over standards of workmanship—this was a plunge they could not bring themselves willingly to take.

And yet it was a plunge they must take. At least it so seemed to those who had the responsibility of deciding the matter, and for these reasons:

1. The workers could possibly compel their demands by force. Their successful eighteen weeks' strike of two years ago, and the unanimous strike vote of last spring pointed to their ability to capture the coveted power by their own might.

2. The preferential agreement signed by the company in order to avert a strike implied that additional power was to be transferred to the union.

3. Two years of constructive work, and the self-restraint shown by their refusal to go to war when they had a strike vote in their hands proved them to be unionists of rare and unusual quality. The leaders were men whom the suspicion of graft had never tainted, men of lofty ethical ideals, men not yet permeated by the sordid commercial spirit of the age, which even the trade union of today, alas! has not escaped—and it seemed as if they had earned the right to a greater power over the direction of the interests of their fellow-workers than had yet been granted them.

It is not the purpose of this paper, however, to give an account of our struggle for peace in the garment industry. The experiment is still in progress, and there may be many chapters to write before the end of the story is reached. I refer to it only for the purpose of showing what my intimate contact withthat phase of the labor struggle has revealed to me. And the most significant features of the present-day revolution seem to me to be these:

Labor Adopts the Ethics of Business

The passing of power from the employer to the laborer is going on visibly and obviously before us. What is not so obvious is that with this transfer of power is passing also the economic motive, the self-regarding interest, the anti-social attitude of the employer. The worker is adopting the centrifugal ethics of his master, and the question is: What is to keep society from flying apart? With the laboring class permeated with the anti-social motive of the business world, where are we to find the cohesive power to hold us together, and to keep us from drifting to chaos?

This, it seems to me, is the most important question that the present-day labor struggle suggests. The motive taught by the orthodox political economy of our time is being frankly accepted by the worker. If the successful business man will buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market, so will the laborer. If he will drive the shrewdest possible bargain by fraud, force, or cunning, why not the laborer? If the holder of public office will graft and steal and be smiled upon in his success, why not the walking delegate? If the giant corporation will crush its rival without hindrance, if it will monopolize the market and exploit the consumer for its own profit, why may not the giant trade union do the same thing?

The Coercion of Public Opinion

In a life-span of sixty years I have been a witness of a remarkable change in a great industry. When a young man I worked for fifteen years at the trade of coal mining. In those days the miners were nearly all of the British nativity—English, Irish, Scotch, or Welsh. In those days mining was a skilled trade. We dug the coal with our hands, our picks, and our brains. I well recall the pride of craftsmanship among us, how we used to sit in the evenings and revel in exploits of coal mining, how the popular hero was the man who had done a prodigious day's work, who could shear the straightest rib, who could undercut the deepest mining, who was the deftest, cleverest with his tools, or who was the mightiest and most enduring in his strength and energy. I recall that it was a disgrace to be thought lazy, to be a shirker of work, to be unfit to do a good job and turn out a workmanlike product; and I remember how I responded to that public opinion in my own reactions. At this distance I am safe in admitting what then I should have been ashamed to confess—that I entered the mines at an early age with reluctance, that I remained there with dread at times amounting to loathing, and that I escaped at the first favorable opportunity. How I hated the five o'clock whistle that called me to work in the morning, and rejoiced when it blew the single toot that announced no work that day! And yet with all this violent revolt against the drudgery of the mines, so sensitive was I to the opinion of my fellows that I dared not fall below the standards they had set. It goaded me to be industrious when I fain would have shirked, to become expert with tools when, without natural aptitude, I might have been a coal butcher instead of a miner. That I averaged well with my class was not due to innate virtue, but to the pressure of the public opinion about me.

We all live up to the expectation of our fellows, whether at work or at play, and my early experience is only an illustration of that fact. What happens to us if that expectation changes, if the standard of public opinion is lowered? When the lucky, the cunning, the rapacious are honored more than the productive, the industrious, and the socially useful, what may we expect? When the ethics of business come to be those of labor, what may we look for?

Coming of the New Immigrant

I have lived to see the standards wholly changed in my trade. With the coming of the machine drill and the machine coal-cutter mining as a skilled trade passed out. With the passing of the pick and the hand tools passed also the British miner, and in his place came the immigrant hordes from Eastern and Southern Europe. To follow the machine needs only brawn, and so brains betook themselves to other callings. Not only has this happened in mining, but in other occupations where machinery has superseded skill. A prominent glass manufacturer told me recently that it was now impossible to find American or English-speaking help to look after the machines. He said it was a matter of wonder and concern among manufacturers where this class of help had gone to. "The American

will no longer work at common labor," he asserted, and it was a matter of fierce competition among employers to get a share of the incoming immigrants to do the work.

Now the point that concerns us is that these are the men who are to operate the trade unions of this country. It is to such as these that the power over industry is to be transferred. Is it any wonder that employers gasp? Indeed, trade-union leaders are hardly less disturbed. In the state of Illinois this year the miners' union presented a bill in the legislature requiring that hereafter no one could obtain a miner's certificate unless he could pass an examination in the English language. It was passed as a safety measure, but no one can escape the question that must have been in the minds of the leaders: How can democracy and self-government as represented in the union be carried on by people who cannot speak our language and who come from countries where both are unknown?

The Corruption of the Laborer

But it is not only the change in the character of the laborer we have to consider. It is that other appalling thing—his acceptance of the business man's ethics. This may not have fully penetrated the lower strata of labor as yet, but in most of the higher ranks it is in full control. Self-interest, enlightened or unenlightened, is the motive in nearly every organized craft, and a union in one trade is a union against every other trade. The business man has taught the laborer his dearest maxim: "To get as much as you can and give as little as you must." Is it any wonder that the worker believes in restriction of output, in making the job last as long as possible, in making labor scarce so that wages will be high? Is it any wonder that his business agent becomes the willing pupil of the business grafter? If a builder offers him a bonus to call a strike on a rival builder why shouldn't he take it? If the contractor has taken a job below price or under a too short time-limit, why shouldn't the business agent help him out by a jurisdictional strike so that he may collect extras or get an extension of time? And if he may do these things, why not engineer a straight hold-up, and refuse to start the men to work until a certain number of hundred or thousand dollars are paid him? Why not, if "business is business" and he plays the game as it is played by his superiors?

These are ugly questions, but they are not questions to be shirked or evaded. And there is worse to follow. For if the taint has reached the labor leader, how can the laborer escape? Why do good work if he can force equal pay for bad work? Why work at all if he can escape it? No man likes to work at an enforced task; certainly no one loves the dull, uninteresting monotony of tending a machine. Tyrannous pressure alone holds him to it—social or economic coercion of one sort or another. Relax that pressure, diminish that coercion, transfer the power that compels from the employer to the laborer, and how is the world's work going to get done? It matters not whether the power be lodged in a trade union or in a socialized state as the Socialists demand, the question of providing an adequate motive for the

endurance of drudgery is not to be escaped. Under the existing system the large profits to employers is the price laborers have had to pay for taskmasters to lash them into activity. Without adequate internal incentive to incite them to toil, they have had to pay enormous bonuses to captains of industry to coerce them to their tasks. But with the transfer of power into their hands, will they continue to hire their drivers? And if they do, will they obey them? And if they don't, how is society going to help itself? Ask the I.W.W.

What the Trade Union Has Done

Let me not be misunderstood. Nothing I have said herein is an argument against trade unionism. I believe the trade union to be not only inevitable but indispensable. Without it our economic system would be, as Carlyle called it, "anarchy plus the constable." In its propaganda it has moved men to as holy enthusiasms as ever did a crusade or a religious revival. In its working it has generated more ethical power than many of our latter-day churches or religious societies. It has introduced rationality into economics, given it the semblance of a logical rationale, put competition of flesh and blood on a different plane from that of commodities. It has forced conceptions of justice and humanity on dry and barren doctrinaires who would have computed sweat and toil in foot pounds, and reduced palpitating hearts and muscles to an empty abstraction—the economic man. I have seen the theory of free competition in labor pushed to its logical ultimate. I have seen mining villages devastated by it, miners on starvation wages, mine-owners on the verge of bankruptcy. Before the strike of 1897 a coal mine in a town was often a liability rather than an asset to the community. Miners could not pay their debts to the merchants, and many of them, robbed of their natural pride and self-respect, were recipients of poor relief from the county. All this was the fruit of the theory that an employer had the right to take his employee's labor into market and sell it at any price that was necessary to get the business. Cut and countercut was the rule of trade, underbid and undersell, get the business at any price was the maxim of the employer. And why not? The labor that he trafficked in was not his own. The sweat, the privation, the pinched belly didn't hurt him, except as he happened to be human, and even then he had to put the screws down as hard as his most vicious competitor or be driven out of business.

But the monstrous thing had to end. The strike of 1897 did it, and out of it grew the national organization of the United Mine Workers. Since then there has been a general improvement in wages, hours, and conditions, which has put the miners on a relatively fair level with other workers of America. Though not always right, the United Mine Workers has been on the whole ably and honestly managed; but even if it were not, I should still be for it, for I could hardly conceive an amount of tyranny or crookedness that would be so disastrous as the unorganized condition previous to 1897.

A School of Ethics

In what I shall say, therefore, it must be understood that I am for trade

organizations as an indispensable part of our economic system. At their best they are the most efficient school of ethics that we have; even at their worst they compel their members to forego immediate personal interest in the interest of the group. But in the better organizations they go much farther than that. In the union with which I have the honor to be associated I may say it has become a school in co-operative management. With its trade agreement, its trade board and board of arbitration, it has been educated in the rights of business as well as in the rights of labor. With its scores of shop chairmen participating in the adjustment of grievances, its active and intelligent deputies, its arbitrators and trade-board members, it is educating not only itself but its employers. During the two years of the last trade agreement the price committee fixed prices in 367 instances without recourse to the board, while the board made decisions which were cheerfully accepted in 170 cases. In the garment industry with its new immigrants, its new union with its new problems, and its freedom from old traditions, we have the promise of a better ideal, a better ethics, a better vision in the labor movement.

Do you wonder that I deplore the spread of the business man's ethics into such an organization as this? The new immigrant comes here fired with the vision of a free America. The union he has created is suffused with an idealism as yet undominated by the sordid motives of trade, or hardened by the bitter conflict which has driven the generous spirit out of many of the older organizations. Touch him with the current business motive and his sentiment becomes sterile. He will no longer care to stitch his morality into his garments. For under this motive what matters it that his brother workman is cheated in his coat? What matter that his fellow-unionist must wear an ill-made, ill-fitting suit, any more than it matters to a miner that some starving, freezing widow must pay her last penny for coal that is half dirt and stone? Or, to carry it farther, if "the devil take the hindmost" is to be the law of the trade union, why blame the brakeman for not walking back a half-mile with his signal when a hundred yards is so much easier—and no one will be the wiser unless there is a rear-end collision as in the New Haven Railroad disaster? It is true that his comrade, his brother, may be the mangled victim of his shirking, but where in the law of business is it written that a man is his brother's keeper?

A Slave Morality

It begins to be apparent how the labor struggle touches the church. In the past the church has been one of the powerful agencies of repression. It has furnished the employer with a justification for his exactions, and the laborer a consolation for his woes. It has taught the toiler to bend his back to the burden, and the reward that was denied today was promised in the sweet by-and-by. "Servants obey your masters" was the admonition, and be humble, meek, non-resistant, think not of the morrow, lay up your treasures not on earth but in heaven—these were the anaesthetics of the church. It was a "slave morality," as Nietzsche called it, but no one can

doubt that it helped to hold the laborer to his job, and even to find some satisfaction therein. For was it not promised that they who had a hard time here would have a good time hereafter? Did not Lazarus see Dives in hell, and was it not affirmed in Holy Writ that it was easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven?

Self-regarding Motive Breaks Down

So remote seem these teachings today that it is almost an ungenerous taunt to recall them. Yet it is not so intended. There is no doubt that for centuries the church provided the reluctant worker with some of the most powerful incentives to effort. Perhaps through the slowly evolving ages society could devise no better motive, or if it could, the toiler would be unable to respond to it. But it all belongs to a dead age—never again to be recalled. The serious fact we now have to confront is that the whole range of motives furnished by the church of yesterday is discredited and impotent. Where along the red battle front of modern industrial war has the church carried as much as a flag of truce? At Lawrence, at Patterson, in West Virginia, where was the religious teacher of yesterday? What zealot would go up to the copper country today and offer the strikers heaven or hell as a substitute for wages? What theory of the atonement or the cleansing blood of Christ would stay the rebellion of the Colorado miners? How remote, how unreal it all seems. How much nearer, how much more vital and human is the action of the Illinois miners in sending a hundred thousand dollars to each group of struggling comrades in Colorado and Michigan.

The problem of the church today is: How can it again get that nearness, that vital contact with the hearts of men, which it has lost? How overcome that indifference, that hostility, which the class-conscious worker feels toward it? How justify its existence in the new world of interests and ideals in which it finds itself today?

I have put the difficulties of its position strongly, but, I hope, not discouragingly. If the church must abandon its old landmarks it is only doing what every social movement of our day is doing. If it must cut loose from a morality which has become immoral, it obeys here also the inevitable trend of the age. For if there is anything the progress of the labor movement has compelled us to see, it is that the self-regarding motive as the sole basis of economics has broken down. Neither in religion nor industry is it longer possible. As soon as it proceeds to its logical ultimate, and is accepted as the working-creed of the laborer, anarchy at once engulfs us. Sun-clear is the dictum of the age that the atomistic view of the self is no longer possible, that human interest must attach itself to something larger than the ego, that devotion to something beyond the individual good is necessary to the salvation of society.

Where Labor Problems Become Religious

Here the church finds itself on its own ground and the labor question becomes a religious problem. How can the church help to answer the question? Not by publishing social programs,

by propagating panaceas, by devising legislative schemes, or by preaching political remedies. Its function is far deeper, far more fundamental than that. It is by reaching down into those springs of power from which all actions come; it is by tapping those fountains of energy from which all issues flow; it is by generating those currents of sympathy by which all values are transvaluated. To put it briefly: From what has been said it is clear that the main features of the present-day labor struggle may be summed up thus:

1. That the power in industry is being transferred from the employer to the laborer.

2. That with the transfer of power is transferred also the economic motive—to get all you can and give as little as you must.

3. That when applied to labor the self-regarding motive will break down, and will be shown to be utterly impotent to do the world's work.

4. That the salvation of society depends on the development of an other-regarding motive, an internal incentive that will urge to effort when social and economic coercions are no longer able to compel.

Intimations of such a motive have never been wanting in human society, and never have its manifestations been so abundant or so fruitful as at present. The self-consuming labors of artists, scientists, publicists testify overwhelmingly to the presence of an incentive which laughs at money, and scorns financial success. The superb self-forgetfulness of the great army of social workers who give of time, money, and effort, without stint and without reward, is another monument to its power. Consider, also, the devotees of the innumerable causes of our time, political, social, religious. Think of the millions of socialists, the great army of trade-unionists, the host of uplifters of every rank and grade—all touched by some vision of the Holy Grail, all possessed by some spirit larger than their own. Think of the modern mystics, transcendentalists, idealists, theosophists, Christian Scientists, New Thoughtists—the endless medley of faddists and freaks of every metaphysical shade and description—all bent on proving that the heart of being is good, and all intent on showing man's kinship with a Self that is infinite and eternal.

The Age Is Religious

In the presence of these and other religious manifestations of our time dare we say that the age is irreligious? Dare we say that we have not here the promise and potency of a spiritual power that is to re-create industry and regenerate society; that we have not here the elements from which a new renaissance of religion will arise, a renaissance that will sweep from the arena of action the petty ambitions and values that dominate it; that will give new aims, new enthusiasms, new incentives to effort, and furnish an ideal of success that will be a man's size?

Let the church of tomorrow lift its head from the shadows. Let it rise to the majesty of its mission. From the cave of superstition let it emerge; from the fear of knowledge let it be freed. Bondage of dead men's thoughts, dread of superman's daring, apprehension of the good that is "beyond good and evil"

—from all these let it be delivered. With its face to the morning let it stand forth erect and unafraid, champion and interpreter of life—the good life, the common life, the one life that throbs in the heart of man, that shines in the shimmering star, that flows unbroken down the ages from a timeless beginning to an endless eternity.

In its presence the illusions of self will fall. By its illumination will man see that he is not a thing of shreds and patches, but part of the creative power of the universe; not a bit of pink protoplasm bounded on the outside by skin and the inside by atoms, but a point focalized in time of that unbounded soul stuff of which he has hitherto conceived his gods to be made. With such a vision he can as little play with dollars as he can with the glass beads and wampum of the savage. The thirst of creation will be on him. Hoarding of millions, building of fortunes, will seem trivial; nothing will satisfy but the building of cities, states, civilizations; the creation of arts, laws, institutions; the establishment of industrial and social systems that will afford a fit environment for the evolving and enlarging life, that will make of earth a paradise of opportunity, and of man a co-worker with God in the creation of the cosmos.

Can the modern church kindle the vision, awaken the consciousness, inflame the enthusiasm that will generate this renaissance? If it can, it will so make its greatest contribution to the forces that are working to humanize the labor struggle of today.

A NEW TESTAMENT ANNIVERSARY: 1514–1914

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED, PH.D.
Associate Professor of Biblical and Patristic Greek, University of Chicago

The year 1914 marks the four-hundredth anniversary of the first printing of the Greek New Testament. On January 10, 1514, at Alcalá de Henares, near Madrid, and under the auspices of the University of Alcalá or Complutum, the first printed edition of the New Testament in the original Greek was finished. It was a Catholic prelate, Cardinal Francisco Ximenez de Cisneros, archbishop of Toledo and archchancellor of the kingdoms of Castile, who was responsible for the undertaking. It was part of a larger plan, instituted in 1502 in celebration of the birth of an heir to the Spanish throne. Ferdinand and Isabella had a daughter, Juana, who had married Philip the Handsome. In 1502 a son was born to them, who grew up to be the Emperor Charles V. The Cardinal's way of celebrating his birth was to set about producing at the University of Alcalá a great edition of the Bible both in its original tongues and

in its principal versions. The Vulgate Latin Bible had been in print for half a century before 1514, and the Hebrew Old Testament for twenty-six years (since 1488). But for the New Testament, Christian scholars had been content to use the Latin Vulgate until the Cardinal set out in 1502 to produce, with the aid of Lopez de Stunica and other scholars, an edition which should include the New Testament in Greek, the Old Testament in Hebrew, the Aramaic version of the Pentateuch, the Greek version of the Old Testament, and the Vulgate Latin of the whole Bible. The work has come to be called, from the Latin name of the university, the Complutensian Polyglot.

The New Testament volume was finished first, and the colophon at the end of the text is dated January 10, 1514. The Greek text is beautifully printed in shapely Byzantine letters, with the Latin Vulgate in a narrower column beside it. The order of the books is interesting, for after the Gospels come the epistles of Paul and Hebrews, and after them, Acts, the Catholic epistles, and Revelation. A concise Greek-Latin lexicon is included after the text. The Old Testament volumes followed later, with three main columns on a page, the Hebrew in the outer column, the Septuagint Greek in the inner, and the Latin Vulgate in the center, "like Jesus between the two thieves," as the editors put it in their preface. The whole great work was finished in 1517 and in that year the Cardinal died. But its publication was not authorized by Pope Leo X until 1520, and it does not seem to have passed into circulation until 1522.

Meantime extraordinary consequences were springing from the mere rumor of it. John Froben, the Basel printer, heard of the Cardinal's enterprise, and with the very modern ambition of anticipating him, determined to produce a New Testament edition of his own. In the spring of 1515 he wrote to Erasmus, who had been for some years in England, and asked him to edit the Greek text. He did so with such expedition that within a year the whole, with a Latin translation, was completed and issued. The last page bears the date, February, 1516. A second edition followed in 1519, a third in 1522, and others later. In these the numerous misprints of his hasty first edition were largely corrected, though not all the changes were for the better. Erasmus himself admitted that his first edition was "precipitated rather than edited." Few single Greek manuscripts contained the whole New Testament, and Erasmus had to depend upon different manuscripts for different parts of the text. For the Revelation he made use of but one, and that a defective one, but where there were gaps in it, Erasmus simply retranslated the Latin Vulgate into Greek of his own, and printed that. But the enterprise of Froben and the diligence of Erasmus had compassed their end: they had anticipated the Cardinal, and his sumptuous volumes were not put into circulation until two of Erasmus' editions were exhausted and his third was appearing.

Yet upon the work of Erasmus great consequences hung. Martin Luther, in concealment at the Wartburg in 1521, made his German translation of the New Testament from Erasmus' second edition,

and William Tindale used the first three editions of Erasmus in translating the New Testament into English (1524–25). It was the distinctive quality of the Reformers' versions that they broke with the Vulgate and translated directly from the Greek, and it was the Greek of Froben and Erasmus that they used. The significance of Luther's translation for the German Reformation need only be suggested. But with Tindale's New Testament (1525) began that notable series of English versions which, under the hands of Coverdale, John Rogers, Whittingham, and Matthew Parker, led at length to the Authorized Version of 1611, into which elements from all its seven English predecessors were combined.

The men who produced the first editions of the Greek New Testament did not exert themselves to search out ancient codices from which to print their text, nor did they gather a great number of manuscripts of any sort for their purpose. The Spanish Cardinal did indeed borrow a manuscript or two from Rome, but these were not remarkable ones. Erasmus used at first but five manuscripts, only two of which contained the Gospels, and no one of them the whole New Testament. Nor were these Erasmian manuscripts of any great age or textual excellence; they belonged to the latest period, the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, when a late and corrupt type of text, the Byzantine, had long prevailed. The great Vatican codex, oldest and best of all New Testament manuscripts, had already lain for a generation in the Vatican Library, but it seems to have attracted little attention and certainly exerted no influence. But it must be remembered that the great wealth of really ancient New Testament texts, on which modern editors build so exclusively, was undiscovered in 1514 and 1516. Some Huguenot admirer gave the first of them to Theodore Beza in 1562, and from that great scholar it took its name. The Codex Alexandrinus was sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople to Charles I in 1627. The New Testament writing on the Paris palimpsest of St. Ephrem was not discovered till about 1700. Tischendorf found the Sinaitic codex at St. Catherine's in 1859. It was precisely the growing weight of such ancient materials, dating from the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, that had so modified the New Testament text a generation ago that a revision of the Authorized translation became imperative. Nor are such discoveries at an end. The Freer Gospels were bought in Egypt in 1906, the Koridethi Gospels have only recently finally emerged from the Caucasus, and papyrus fragments of the fifth, fourth, and even the third century are constantly coming to light in the course of excavations in Egypt. In fact new textual materials are accumulating with a rapidity hardly ever before equaled, and while the New Testament text will probably undergo little further modification, much may yet be learned as to the history of its early transmission.

The Complutensian edition of 1514 was the first of more than a thousand editions of the New Testament in Greek. The earlier editors were generally content to copy the texts of their predecessors or of late manuscripts easy of access. But the editions of the past

century have beeen more and more broadly based, until where Erasmus used five manuscripts one recent editor employs four hundred, besides quotations in two hundred ancient Christian authors. The latest New Testament editor, Von Soden (1913), has taken account of a still wider range of manuscript witnesses. The Greek New Testament manuscripts definitely known to exist now number more than two thousand five hundred, besides manuscripts of ancient versions, which are still more numerous, and every month adds to the list, so that the student of the New Testament text labors under an embarrassment of riches. Varied forces are contributing to add to these resources: scientific excavation, travel, amateur collection, the opening of libraries once difficult of access, and war in the East, which always dislodges manuscripts from their ancient homes.

Four hundred years have passed since the Cardinal's stately folio was finished. It is now the most treasured possession of many a library, though modern learning has long outgrown the meager materials made use of in its preparation. The university which the Cardinal founded and fostered, and which was attended in the sixteenth century by twelve thousand students, was removed in 1836 to Madrid, and its former home at Alcalá now stands a silent monument to vanished greatness. In the collegiate church near by is the monument to the Cardinal, who after the deaths of Ferdinand and Isabella was for a time master of Spain but whose most lasting glory is the Complutensian edition, through which he stimulated Christian learning and set in motion spiritual influences of more far-reaching importance than he dreamed or perhaps desired.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH FEDERATION

II. KINDS AND CHARACTERISTICS

A. W. ANTHONY

Chairman of Commission on State and Local Federation, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America

In 1883, in his articles describing an imaginary compact of churches, termed the "Christian League of Connecticut," Dr. Washington Gladden gave one of the many impulses which have eventuated in the formation of federations and cooperative combinations of churches and Christian workers. The oldest of the federations now listed, so far as known, is that in Methuen, Massachusetts, dating from 1887, which bears the name, suggested by Dr. Gladden, the "Christian League of Methuen." So far as the *Directory of Federations* is concerned, which the Commission on State and Local Federations of the Federal Council of

Churches of Christ in America has prepared, this league is the file leader in point of time.

The Christian League of Methuen is composed of seven churches representing five denominations, one Baptist church, one Congregational church, two Methodist Episcopal churches, two Primitive Methodist churches, and one Universalist church. Every member of these churches is a member of the league, for when a church votes to join the league its vote makes every member of such a church a voting member in the public meetings of the league. Under the direction of an Executive Committee this league has united the efforts of Christians in securing and manifesting Christian unity and in advancing the moral and social interests of the community. In general the league has aimed at co-operation among churches, districting of the town for church responsibilities, the recommendation of specific denominational enterprises, and reciprocal exchanges between the denominations. Specific tasks undertaken have related to the public health, the protection of juveniles, civic righteousness, the observance of the Sabbath, the conduct of vacation Bible schools, the prevention of vice, social and religious surveys of the community, and the wider use of church equipment.

The Interdenominational Commission of Maine, which owes its inception to the suggestion of a Methodist minister and the co-operation of a Congregational college president, blazed a somewhat new path in 1890. Organized primarily "to prevent waste of resources and effort in the smaller towns, and to stimulate missionary work in the destitute regions," its functions for the first ten or twelve years of its existence were almost entirely of a judicial character, as a tribunal to which cases of friction, due to overcrowding or competition between denominations, were referred for adjudication; and its utterances were in general to one denomination or another, in effect, "Hands off!" During the later years of its life it has more and more addressed its constituent parts with the appeal "Hands together!" It has devised a plan of reciprocal exchanges between denominations which has been approved by the Commission on Home Missions of the Federal Council, and recommended by the Home Missions Council of the home mission boards of the denominations of the country. It has held conferences of denominational workers on missions to foreign-speaking people in Maine, and on rural betterment. It has recommended a plan which has been taken up by the Bible Society of Maine for a "missionary on wheels" (i.e., with horse and carriage) "to have pastoral, educational, and agricultural oversight" in a group of towns in which other agencies are not active. One of its fundamental principles has been never to undertake itself a task for the performance of which there are already in existence other organizations.

The statement of principles formulated by the Interdenominational Commission of Maine in 1891 has been so extensively repeated in the constitutions and platforms of other federations in all parts of the country, and even in the model constitution put forth by the Federal Council, as to merit reproduction here:

Church extension into destitute communities should be conducted, as far as practicable, according to the following considerations:

1. No community in which any denomination has any legitimate claim should be entered by any other denomination through its official agencies without conference with the denomination or denominations having said claims.

2. A feeble church should be revived, if possible, rather than a new one established to become its rival.

3. The preferences of a community should always be regarded by denominational committees, missionary agents, and individual workers.

4. Those denominations having churches nearest at hand should, other things being equal, be recognized as in the most advantageous position to encourage and aid a new enterprise in their vicinity.

5. In case one denomination begins gospel work in a destitute community it should be left to develop that work without other denominational interference.

6. Temporary suspension of church work by any denomination occupying a field should not be deemed sufficient warrant in itself for entrance into that field by another denomination. Temporary suspension may be deemed abandonment when a church has had no preaching and held no meetings for an entire year or more.

7. All questions of interpretation of the foregoing statements, and all cases of friction between denominations, or churches of different denominations, should be referred to the commission through its executive committee.

The New York (City) Federation of Churches, organized in 1895, expends more money ($20,000 a year), includes churches and organizations of more denominations (over forty in number), and is engaged in a more varied, and in some respects more difficult, task than any other federation in the country. Its general object is to ally its co-operating organizations in "aggressive, co-operative work in behalf of the spiritual, physical, educational, economic, and social interests of individual, family, and community life" in the city of New York.

As a guide in classifying and tabulating federations, when a directory of federations was undertaken, it was necessary to fix upon some standard of inclusion or exclusion, and determine some definitions. It was agreed that a local federation shall be regarded as—

an interdenominational body whose members are elected by the membership of the several local churches, or are appointed by committees or officials of these respective churches as representative of the entire church.

This definition excludes from the category of federations those interdenominational organizations which are limited in membership to one sex, to one age, or to one class of members, or are limited in their objects and purposes, as charitable organizations, educational clubs, or societies for reform. The Young Men's Christian Association and the Young Women's Christian Association are not entered as federations, although they have many of the characteristics of federations; but their activities are limited in each case by considerations both of sex and of age. Out of the Men and Religion Forward Movement issued in many places permanent organizations, which have interdenominational functions and present the characteristics of a federation of churches, with the exception that men only are eligible to membership; all such organizations are

excluded by the definition from the list of federations. The members of a federation may be all men, but yet they must be representative of the entire church, men and women, in order to be recognized as federations, in what may be regarded as the technical sense of the word.

The definition of a state federation, as set forth by the Commission on State and Local Federations, is as follows:

> A state federation is an interdenominational body the members of which are elected, or otherwise officially appointed, as representatives of the denominational organizations within a state.

Here stress is upon the official character of the representation; it is not voluntary; it is elected or officially appointed; and the phrasing is intended to be broad enough to include election by synod, convention, conference, association, or other state organization of a denomination, and appointment by a committee, a board, a bishop, or other official duly authorized by special vote or by denominational polity. The state federation, however, is not composed of local churches, as its constituent elements, nor of denominations, in the broad, national sense, but of those fragments of denominations which exist within the limits of a state and have organized for common purposes within the state.

Within a local community there have arisen three quite distinct types of federated churches. The definitions given will distinguish them and somewhat describe them. The so-called "union church," which has been known for many decades, may be defined as—

> an organization for worship and the exercise of ecclesiastical functions locally, the members of which sever connection with other churches and have membership in this alone. It is an undenominational church.

The name "undenominational church" fits the organization better than "union church," inasmuch as nothing has united excepting the individual members, and they are united on the basis of their individual characters and purposes without reference to denominational preferences or connections. Such a church, composed of individuals, is no more a "union" church than is a denominational church; but it is distinctively and emphatically an undenominational church, without affiliations and alliances connecting it with other churches or with an ecclesiastical organization.

In Eastern Pennsylvania there are "union churches," bearing this designation, which are really federated churches. They consist of two congregations and two organizations, of the Reformed church in America (Dutch) and the Reformed church in the United States (German), distinct denominationally, which worship as one body under one pastor. On one Sunday they may gather as the "Dutch" church and on the next Sunday meet as the "German" church, the same people, in the same pews, and with the same pastor. Their benevolences, which under this dual arrangement do not receive their due attention, flow in the channels which may be designated upon the special Sunday when they are brought in, or as otherwise assigned. It is said that between ten and twenty thousand Christians, belonging to these two denominations, worship together in these "union churches." But these are not undenominational churches; and are not

that type of church which usually is intended by the term "union church."

The definition of a federated church runs as follows:

> A federated church is a combination of two or more churches, usually small and weak, each preserving its own ecclesiastical existence and connections with its own denomination, but as one local church, employing one pastor, and usually maintaining all services in common. Within it benevolences for missionary enterprises are cultivated and gifts are sent to the several denominational headquarters as agreed upon.

Such churches have increased in number during the last decade. Successful instances of them are reported in Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, and New Jersey; and these union churches of the Reformed churches in Eastern Pennsylvania are of this class. Where the sectarian spirit is too strong for the formation of one denominational church within a community, the federated church proves useful. It has the advantage of preserving the history and traditions of churches once vigorous and independent but weakened by the outgo of population, and it also retains, for the denominational officers and the denominational organizations of a state, an equipoise of interests, without painful amputation or humiliating extinction.

Another type of church, sometimes called a federated church, should be more properly called an interdenominational church. This is defined as—

> a church composed of individuals who do not sever connection with their several churches, but unite for local church purposes in a common organization and thus maintain a dual church relationship.

This interdenominational church is purely local in its functions; it provides services for worship, Sunday school for the instruction of the young, and the social features which may accompany religious forms; and at the same time, to some extent at least, it expects its individual members to retain sympathetic and more or less vital interest in the peculiar ministrations and activities each of his own home church or denomination. The members, as individuals, are not cut off from the enterprise and the testimony of their own denominations, although unserved denominationally by the local church.

Against the "union church," in its purely undenominational character, an increasing consensus of opinion alleges inherent and fatal defects. It lacks the fellowship of other churches; it receives no expert oversight and supervision; it has no adequate source of ministerial supply; no religious literature springs from it or returns to it; it has no direct responsibility for Christian education; it has no alliance with, nor responsibility for, missionary enterprises either at home or abroad; usually it fails of adequate instruction in religious truth, and, in experience, it has been proven still to contain the elements of discord and disunion.

As the local ideal to be sought in rural districts, where the people are few and scattered, the Commission on State and Local Federations recommended to the Executive Committee of the Federal Council, and their recommendation was approved, the following statement:

> We are agreed that the ideal church within a community, too small for two or more churches, is a single denominational church connected with one of the Christian

denominations, equipped and organized for all forms of Christian service at home and abroad, and that the interdenominational church, the federated church, or the union, or undenominational, church should be regarded as expedients, fully justified, although not ideal, when conditions permit nothing better.

This recommendation, in substance, harks back to the great principle, as an expression of practical experience, that unity and diversity are compatible, that Christians, unlike in personal convictions, can combine for worship and for service, and that their worship and their service are of greater consequence to the definite, concrete towns and communities in which they are placed than the free expression of their inner convictions and preferences. This is the basal principle of federation. There is no attempt to obliterate denominations, nor to ignore convictions, nor to minimize truth. The denominations stand for differences; at the same time they are organizations for common purposes, for the spread of the worship of the Lord, and for service to mankind, and in their organized capacities they represent the highest development of the Christian church, functionally considered, with more diversified parts and agencies and more hopes and ideals for the nations of the earth, than any other organization in existence today.

JOHN THE BAPTIST AND CHRIST IN THE SLAVIC TRANSLATION OF JOSEPHUS' "JEWISH WAR"

REV. BERNHARD PICK
Newark, New Jersey

For many a year men have discussed the reference of Josephus to Jesus. This article by Mr. Pick will be interesting to those who have followed this discussion, if for nothing else than that it offers a good illustration of the way in which ancient documents have been reworked by successive writers.

In the same year in which A. Resch published the second edition of his *Agrapha* (Leipzig, 1906), the Russian scholar, A. Berendts, issued his *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im Slavischen "De bello Judaico" des Josephus.* That the Slavic translation of the *Jewish War* by Josephus differed very much from the Greek text of the Jewish historian, as we now have it, containing many additions of a Christian character was known long ago to Slavic scholars, but caused little or no interest outside of Russia. Thanks are therefore due to A. Berendts for having given these additions to the literary world in a German translation, prepared from different manuscripts. This work, however,

was differently received, and his claim that Josephus is the author of the "additions" has found no support,[1] not even by R. Seeberg and Frey, who entered more fully into the subject. The former devoted two articles to the subject in *Die Reformation*, 1906, No. 19/20, reprinted in a collection of his essays *Von Christus und dem Christentum* (Gross-Lichterfelde-Berlin, 1908), whereas Frey referred to Berendts' work in his *Die Probleme der Leidensgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1907). As a matter of course Frey could only touch upon some points. More fully he treated the subject in his *Der slavische Josephusbericht*, etc. (Dorpat, 1908), in which he examined every passage with the result —mostly coinciding with Seeberg—that these additions are the work of a Jew, who wrote in the last third of the first century and who was acquainted with traditions current in Jewish circles independent of Christian tradition and literature. The contents of the additions which betray an entirely Jewish coloring belong to the tradition among the Jews concerning Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity which has little in common with the Gospels and often contradicts them. The text of Berendts, which on the whole is also that of Frey, has been published by Klostermann in Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte* (Bonn, 1911), No. 11, proof enough that the Slavic Josephus additions deserve the attention of scholars.

A. Concerning the Baptist

I. This section is found after *Jewish War*, II, iii, 2, translated according to M′=a manuscript in the Moskow Academy 651:

1. But at that time a man walked among the Jews in strange clothes, having the skin of an ox put on his body, wherever it was not covered by his own hair; 2. but as to his face he looked like a savage 3. He came to the Jews and proclaimed liberty to them, saying: "God has sent me that I may show you the way of the law on which you will get rid of many potentates. 4. And no mortal shall rule over you, except the Most High, who has sent me." 5. And when the people heard it, they rejoiced, and all Judea round about Jerusalem followed him. 6. And nothing else did he unto them, except that he baptized them in the river Jordan and dismissed them, directing them to desist from evil works, and [promising] that an emperor shall be given unto them, who shall deliver them and subdue to them everything insubordinate, but himself will be subject to none, of whom we speak [?] 7. Some blasphemed, but others believed him 8. And when he was brought to Archelaus, and the scribes had assembled they asked who he were and where he had been till now 9. And he answering said: "I am pure—the Spirit of God has introduced me—and I live of cane and roots and wood-shavings" 10. And when they went for him to torment him, whether he would not refrain from those words and deeds, he said to them: "It is for you to desist from your abominable works and to follow the Lord your God" 11. And Simon, an Essena and scribe, rose up in anger and said: "We read daily the divine books 12. but thou, who hast just come from the woods like an animal, hast the courage to teach us and to seduce the people with thy ungodly words" 13.

[1] H. Jordan, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 1907, p. 511, thinks that these pieces belong to Christian tradition of the second or third century, and consequently have no more value than our other apocryphal gospels. What they record is mostly derived from the Gospels, on the other hand, from tradition mixing transmitted matter and wild embellishment.

And he advanced to abuse his body 14. But the other reproving them, said: "I shall not reveal to you the mystery which is among you, since you did not want it 15. By that an unspeakable misfortune has come upon you and because of you" 16. And having thus spoken, he went away to the other side of Jordan, no one daring to reprimand him and he did [what he had done] also before.

II. Inserted after *Jewish War*, II, ix, 1; translated according to M′, and C (=cod. 64/1303, in Petersburg):

1. When Philip was in possession of his power, he saw in a dream how an eagle pulled out both his eyes 2. And he assembled all his sages 3. And as each interpreted the dream in his own way, that man, concerning whom we wrote before, that he went about in skins of animals and cleansed the people in the waters of the Jordan, suddenly appeared before him 4. And he said: "Hear the word of the Lord, the dream which thou hast seen 5. The eagle denotes thy venality, since that bird is violent and rapacious. 6. And that sin will take away thine eyes, which are thy power, and thy wife." 7. And having thus spoken, Philip died toward evening and his power was given to Agrippa.

III. Following immediately after II in M′:

1. And Herod his brother, took his wife Herodias 2. On her account all scribes despised him, but dared not accuse him openly 3. But that man only who was called a savage, came to him with fury and said: "Wicked one, why has thou taken thy brother's wife? 4. As thy brother has died a merciless death, thou also shalt be cut down by the heavenly sickle 5. God's decree will not be delayed but will kill thee by evil tribulations in foreign countries 6. For thou raisest not seed unto thy brother, but satisfiest thy carnal desires and committest adultery, since he has left four children." 7. When Herod heard [this], he was angry and commanded to beat him and drive him away. 8. But he constantly reproved Herod who ordered to do violence to him and to strike him down. 9. And he was of a singular character and his mode of life was not human. Like a fleshless spirit, thus he also continued 10. His lips knew of no bread; not even at Easter did he eat unleavened bread, saying: in remembrance of God, who delivered the people from bondage, [such bread] was given to be eaten, for a consolation, because the way was gloomy [or as Klostermann translates, following K-cod. 444 (322), in the Kazan religious Academy: for a flight, because the way required haste]. 11. Wine and strong drink he would not even allow to be near him 12. He abhorred animal food and punished every wrong and only used chips of wood.

B. Concerning Christ

IV. Following *Jewish War*, II, ix, 3, according to M′, and S (i.e., cod. 770 of the Moskow library Synod):

1. At that time also a man appeared, if it is also proper to call him a man. 2. His nature as well as his form was human, his appearance, however, was more than human 3. For his deeds were divine, and he wrought strange and powerful miraculous deeds 4. On this account I cannot possibly call him a man 5. And again when I look at the common nature, I cannot also call him an angel 6. And everything which he wrought through some invisible power, he wrought by word and command 7. Some said of him that our [cod. S: the first] lawgiver has risen from the dead and showed many cures and arts. 8. Others, however, said that he was sent from God 9. But in many respects he disobeyed the law and kept not the Sabbath

according to the custom of the fathers 10. Yet again he did nothing shameful and wrong, but brought about everything by his own word. 11. And many among the people [cod. S: the nations] followed him and accepted his teachings. 12. And many souls became wavering, imagining that the Jewish tribes will thereby become free from Roman hands 13. And it was his custom to stay on Mount Olives before the city. 14. And here he also healed the people; 15. And 150 servants and a great multitude of the people assembled about him. 16. And when they perceived his power that he brought about everything by his own word, they asked him to enter into the city and to put down the Roman soldiers [cod. M′: everything Roman] and Pilate, and rule over us [cod. M′: over them]. 17. But he refused this. 18. And when the Jewish leaders heard this, they assembled with the high priest and said: "we are powerless and weak to resist the Romans 19. Since, however, the bow is bent, let us go to Pilate and tell him what we have heard, and we shall be without trouble, lest he hears it from others and we shall be deprived of our property and be killed also ourselves and the children be scattered." 20. And they went and reported to Pilate. 21. And he sent and had many of the people killed 22. And he summoned that worker of miracles. And when he had heard him, he perceived that he is a benefactor and not a malefactor, nor a seducer, nor one anxious to rule, and dismissed him; 23. for he had healed his [M′: the] dying wife. 24. And he went to his customary place and wrought the usual works. 25. And when many people had gathered again around him, his works glorified him more than all. 26. The scribes, being poisoned by envy, gave thirty talents to Pilate, that he might kill him. 27. And having taken [the money], he left it to them to carry out their design. 28. And they took him and crucified him by means of the law [Berendts: against the law; Frey: on account of the law] of the fathers.

V. Inserted *Jewish War*, II, xi, 6 (after the notice on the death of Agrippa), according to M_1 and M_2 (i.e., cod. 279/658 in the Moskow Archives):

1. Claudius sent again his arbitrators to those states: Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander [M_2: Cuspius Fadus Tiberius Alexander; M_1: Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius and Alexander], who both kept the people in peace by not allowing to deviate in anything from the pure law. 2. And in case one would deviate from the word of the law and it was reported to the teachers of the law, he was repeatedly driven away and sent to the presence of the emperor. 3. And when in their time many became known as being servants of the miracle-worker described before, and when they spoke to the people of their teacher, that he is alive, although he had also [M_2 omits "also"] died and that he shall deliver us [M_1M_2: you] from the bondage, many among the people listened to them and received their law 4. not on account of their glory, for they belonged to the humble [M_2: to the humble, the apostles], some being apostles, some being cobblers, some makers of sandals, and others artisans. 5. And what wonderful signs they performed, in truth everything that they wished! 6. And when those noble governors noticed the seduction of the people, they considered with the scribes to seize and kill them that the small matter not be small, when it has completed itself in the big. 7. But they were afraid and frightened over the signs, by saying: "such miracles happen not in a right way. 8. But if they originate not out of God's decreee, they will soon be convinced." 9. And they gave them authority to act according to their will. 10. Importuned by them, however, afterwards they dis-

missed, some to the emperor, some to Antioch, others, however, to distant countries, to test the matter. 11. Claudius however removed the two governors, and sent Cumanus.

VI. *Jewish War*, V, v, 2, according to M_1:

[In the description of the Temple, after the words "that no foreigners should go within the Sanctuary, for that second court of the Temple was called the Sanctuary, and was ascended by fourteen steps from the first court" (and whose upper part was built like a square, so M_2), we read the following]: and over those tablets with inscriptions, being a fourth tablet with an inscription in those letters [i.e., in Hebrew letters] reading: Jesus has not ruled as king [on earth, so in K], he was crucified by the Jews because he announced the destruction of the city and the desolation of the temple.

[Then follows: and toward the eastern side was a gate and a place for the women for worship and prayer.]

VII. Following *Jewish War*, V, v, 4, according to M_1M_2:

[After a description of the curtain (Καταπέτασμα) we read the following]: 1. In former times this Katapetasma was whole, because the people was godly, but now it was most lamentable to look upon it. 2. It was suddenly torn from top to bottom, when they delivered the benefactor, the man and who because of his deeds was no man, unto death by bribery. 3. And one [and I, so K] could speak of many other terrible signs, which happened at that time. 4. And it was said, that that man after being killed was not found in the grave after burial. 5. Some pretend that he was risen, others, however, that he had been stolen by his friends. 6. But I know not who is right 7. For of himself a dead man cannot rise, but indeed with the help of the prayer of another righteous man, unless he be an angel or some of the heavenly powers, or God himself appears as man [M_2: or God has appeared as if he were a man] and brings about what he wants and walks among men and falls or lies down and rises up according to his will. 8. Others, however, said that it was impossible to steal him, because round about his grave keepers had been placed, 30 [M_2: 1000] Romans, but 1,000 Jews. 9. This much about that Katapetasma; with reference to the cause of its being torn. There are [different statements, so Frey].

VIII. *Jewish War*, VI, v, 4, according to M_2:

[In the section which treats of the signs before the destruction of Jerusalem and this in connection with a discussion of an ambiguous oracle we read]:

Some understood this to refer to Herod, others however to that crucified miracle-worker, Jesus, others again to Vespasian.

Such are the additions which are found in the Slavic Josephus, and which contain statements which are not found in the Gospels. Thus in the case of the Baptist his outward appearance, his rôle as interpreter of dreams, and his conflict with the leaders of the people, which induced him to go to the other side of the Jordan. These and other facts show that the author of the Slavic narrative made use of popular traditions which were current alongside of the gospel traditions. The same Jewish hand is also perceptible in the passages concerning Christ. The famous passage in the *Antiquities*, XVIII, iii, 3, commences almost the same as in our text, but it mentions the name of Jesus. A Christian had not the least reason to suppress that name. And whereas, ac-

cording to the statement in the *Antiquities*, "Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him [Jesus] to the cross," the Slavic interpolator states that the Jews had crucified him. This, of course, does not agree with the gospel statement, but the Slavic Josephus only states what Justin Martyr (*Dial.* XVII, 93, 108; *Apol.* I, 35), the Gospel of Peter, and others, state,[1] and a scholar like R. T. Herford, in his *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (London, 1903), remarks: "The Talmud knows nothing of an execution of Jesus by the Romans, but makes it solely the act of the Jews" (p. 86).

Whatever value we may attach to these additions in the Slavic text, it is certain that their authorship belongs to a Jew who wrote mostly after the destruction of Jerusalem and the taking of Masada, i.e., after 73 A.D. The additions may have been inserted into the Aramaic copy of Josephus' work in the *Jewish War* and may have been translated with the original work into Greek, or may have been originally written in Greek and inserted into the Greek translation. That such a translation was made before Josephus prepared his own text in Greek is very probable. From the preface to the *Jewish War* we learn that Josephus wrote a history of the Jewish War "in the language of our country" (*τῷ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ*) which he sent to the Upper Barbarians (*τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις*), viz., "Parthians, Babylonians, the remotest Arabians, and those of our nation beyond Euphrates, with the Adiabeni and whom he made acquainted whence the war begun, what miseries it brought upon us [viz., the Jews] and after what manner it ended." Can these nations have understood a book which was written in Aramaic or Hebrew? What was more natural than to have a translation made into a language which was understood by all? And such a language was then the Greek. How soon Josephus issued his Greek edition for those who lived under the rule of the Romans (*κατὰ τὴν Ρωμάιων ἡγεμονίαν*) we know not. But, being an original edition, it soon superseded the translation from the Aramaic; and since it was written for readers in the West, many things may have been changed or represented differently.

But not all copies of the Greek translation of the *Jewish War* disappeared, as may be seen from the Slavic rendering. How it came about that the latter was made from the Greek translation and not from the original work of Josephus will be difficult to explain. There is no doubt that the first Greek translation of the *Jewish War* originated in the East, because there the Aramaic was better understood. Considering the connections existing between the Slaves and the East, it is possible that the work of Josephus may have reached the Slaves, ere Byzantium or the West brought to them the original Greek edition. However this may be, the Slavic text deserves the attention of the students of history.

[1] Cf. "Der Prozess Jesu und der Anteil der Juden an seinem Tode" in W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1909), pp. 198 f.

CAN RELIGION BE MADE SCIENTIFIC?

ALLYN K. FOSTER, D.D.
Pastor First Baptist Church, Worcester, Massachusetts

Our modern thought is increasingly dominated by scientific methods. This is as true of theology as it is of biology. The Biblical World *believes that religion is afraid of no fact. It further believes that in the search for truth serious attention must be given to working hypotheses. If some of these hypotheses are found to be unworkable, the cause of truth will have been advanced as truly as if they had been thoroughly established. With this conviction in the center of his soul no minister needs to fear anything except falsehood. It is better to be a martyr for the truth than to build up bank accounts on popularized obscurantism. Dr. Foster speaks as a successful pastor and his words ought to bring courage and enthusiasm to all his colleagues in the great work of making known God to the world. For if the God who saves be not the God of the universe, what is the use of trying to worship him? The church answered that question once and for all when it repudiated the pluralistic philosophy of Gnosticism.*

I can remember the time when it was a crime to think of reason in connection with religion. I can also remember the time when science was a synonym for infidelity. I am now satisfied after years of reflection that religion has won her way to a rightful place among the sciences.

There is no such thing as a warfare between sciences. Chemistry has no quarrel with physics; astronomy and mathematics live together in perfect harmony, are indeed necessary to each other's existence; biology would be impossible without psychology, and geology is the basis of reality for them all. A science is by no means so formidable a thing as we are accustomed to think. It is merely an orderly statement of things naturally related to each other. When all the sciences, physical and metaphysical, are properly understood they will be seen to treat of facts closely woven together into a unity. This unity is what we call the universe. The attempt to construct this unity through the proper understanding of all the sciences is the task of philosophy. Theology is one of the metaphysical sciences. It deals with the facts of religion. It is, therefore, absurd ever to speak of the warfare between science and religion. They are parts of the same whole. The difficulty has risen in the past from the fact that both theology and science have been too dogmatic. Science has too often rushed breathlessly from its investigations to announce a final theory of the universe, which has practically excluded the considerations of theology.

Theology, on the other hand, has refused to investigate scientifically, and with characteristic arrogance has denied audience to the natural sciences. The logical result has been a warfare between the votaries of each. In each case the difficulty arose from too hasty

conclusions. It is never safe to settle a matter until all the evidence is in. The natural and the theological sciences have never been at war. Their misguided votaries frequently have been.

We are now coming to see, because of a better understanding between these two great departments of knowledge, that the physical and the metaphysical sciences are mutually supplementary. This has been brought about by the increasing willingness of theology to examine the results of natural science, and to the extension of natural studies into new fields. Science now recognizes that the physical universe is by no means the limit of its domain. Facts are no longer limited by their reduction to pounds, inches, and velocities. There are other senses, so to speak, besides the physical senses which can register facts and forces. One of the hopeful signs of the times is this twofold drift of science toward religion, and of religion toward science.

It is safe to say that when science shall be able to utter itself in elemental terms, its conclusions, to say the least of them, will in no sense be found to disagree essentially with the conclusions of theology, stated in terms of universal science. Much patient work remains to be done on both sides, but I predict that in the next generation there will be such refining and purifying of both theology and science, that the result I have named will become a reality.

Perhaps the greatest bone of contention between science and theology has been the matter of revelation. Science declares that its field is the order of the universe as it exists at any given moment. It cannot base any conclusions upon ideas which do not in some way yield to experiment and investigation. Laws are immutable. Cause and effect always coexist. What, therefore, is claimed as a fact ought to yield to experiment. This is certainly a reasonable attitude if one accepts the premises implied, but the physical universe is an immensely larger thing now than it was thirty years ago. To mention only one fact, the mental sciences have forced an entirely new section of facts upon natural sicence. In this respect alone some such word as "spiritual" must find its way into the vocabulary of science. The Society for Psychical Research would have been unthinkable thirty-five years ago. All such assertions of fact as are made by this society would have been referred to the department of neurology. It is therefore plain that natural science must take cognizance of facts both in the material and in the non-material universe. It is along this tiny vein that I think rich deposits will be found before long.

On the other hand, theology has not been satisfied to remain intrenched behind revelation. It is not enough now to say in support of any theological theory, "Thus saith the Lord." Reverent thinkers are beginning to see that however mysterious and real revelation may be, it ought to be able to justify itself by something other than fiat. If the great experiences of religion cannot yield to orderly statement like the facts in other fields of science, there is every just reason to suspect their validity. It will therefore be a contribution to both theology and science if contact can be established at one point or another. It is my belief that they both start from

the same basis and, to a considerable extent, proceed by the same method, and in many cases reach the same general conclusions. So far as I can see there is no valid reason why the differences which exist, and, in the nature of the case must exist, may not ultimately be explained, first, by the difference of material treated, and second, by restatement in larger terms, of the conclusions already reached in each field.

By the first I mean merely that what we call matter and spirit are widely divergent to our comprehension. All the laws of matter cannot be paralleled by laws of the spirit. The tangible and the intangible, while parts of the same whole, cannot ever be wholly expressed in terms of each other. The sap in a very real sense is the tree, but we cannot see leaves, roots, and branches in the sap. That spiritual thing we call life is not translatable into physical organs. The life is more than any tangible embodiment of it. There is, however, a natural law in the spiritual world. Otherwise the spiritual world would be unnatural, and this to both scientists and thoughtful theologians is unthinkable.

In a remarkable article in the *Journal of Religious Psychology*, Vol. I, President G. Stanley Hall, of Clark University, has this to say:

> Certain it is that the doctrine, not only of inspiration, but even of revelation, needs a form of restatement that is more consonant with psychic facts. . . . . Faith is shown to be one of the supreme words in the vocabulary of the soul, the bearer of the unseen world of the morally ideal and the organ of that best part of history, which is not yet written because it has not yet occurred. . . . . Scripture is coming to be slowly revealed as the chief practical textbook of the race in a large ethnic psychology that reaches to the depths and does not so scrupulously confine itself, as do so many of its modern academic expositions, to the surface phenomena of psychic life. Prayer, too, is almost a category of the heart, not only a passion of many savages whose lives center in it, but also of the devotees of even a religion like Buddhism which gives it no object and provides no place for it in its cult. . . . . Biology has lately given the world a new conception of death and its function in the world, which teems with possibilities for religion which are only just beginning to be exploited. More perhaps than anything else, modern psychic study emphasizes sin and evil as the church grows euphemistic about them. . . . . We cannot here characterize or perhaps even name all the old problems that are beginning to glow with new light like the baby faces awaiting incarnation on the canvases of the old masters.

If we may not entirely agree with Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton that science and religion are approaching each other with the speed of a locomotive, we may at least point out that there are many grounds for mutual tolerance, and for the hope of an ultimate happy understanding.

What then shall be the basis of comity between science and theology? Previous differences must not deter us here. Traditional animosities must be forgotten. We must start from a common basis. We are to ask, first of all: What is the basis of science? What is the ultimate reality to which all experiment and observation lead? Beyond all the observable reactions in the field of science, past all the laws which reveal the order

of phenomena in the physical universe, lies the great fact of mystery. The array of these reactions and laws in all departments of science is bewildering.

As we think of the single science of chemistry, that most universal and intimate of all the sciences, compassing as it does heaven and earth, including in its domain star dust and thought-processes, its lines run unchallenged throughout the universe. To the scientist all is order and harmony. The relation and interrelation among substances is unfailing and accurate, and can be expressed in algebraic terms, and yet behind all these certainties lies the impenetrable mystery.

The ultimate fact of chemistry is what we call affinity. Certain substances possess attractions for certain other substances. Still other substances repel them, and are repelled by them. What is this affinity? Why this regularity of attraction and repulsion? Not a chemist on earth has yet been able to answer. Chemical substances behave thus and so because they behave thus and so. A woman's reason is at last found to be scientific. The same may be said of every other science. Certain definite reactions can be observed and tabulated. Certain laws can be easily deduced from these phenomena, but the very accuracy of these conclusions leads us more swiftly to the mystery itself.

When science insists that it be left to the consideration of facts, this very mystery is the first and the last fact which it must encounter. Behind all the phenomena of all the physical sciences lie forces intelligent, irresistible, and mysterious. They are none the less real because mysterious. In their activities these forces yield themselves to real and regular expression. While we may never know what is their essence, we may always know how they behave.

Science, therefore, has a very extensive and a very real function, though it may never be able to explain the source or the essence of the very material which it handles. It becomes plain, then, that religion and theology must not be ruled out of court, because in the process of their elaboration they encounter unanswered questions. When science speaks of a physical force to which may be attributed the evolution of the universe and of man, it is but saying in another way what the theologian long since said in an attempt to explain the order of creation: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This is little different from declaring that in the beginning was motion, vortex, or force. The scientist himself declares, and this upon a basis of investigation, that this force possesses intelligence, and works in definite ways which may not be contravened; that by the operation of this force upon small beginnings the present order of the world was built up. He declares that this force working upon nebulous material gradually provided the astronomical systems, that by some process not yet discovered life emerged in an infinitesimal cell from which the entire fabric of physical life was built.

Professor Bergson assures us that even intellect is the product of creative physical evolution. To quote his own words: "We think matter." Whether there be a definite plan or not, this force which the scientist postulates is therefore responsible for the existing order in the universe. Matter, organism, mind,

and personality are the creations of this force.

The theologian merely accepts in more definite form what the material scientist declares. He merely says that a force cannot create anything greater than itself, and, therefore, having been taught by the scientist to recognize intelligence and personality in the source of all things, he is justified in believing in a personal, intelligent, providential God.

If this does not prove the existence of the Christian's God, it at least leaves Christian theology where science is left. The only difference is a difference of terms. Science no longer declares boastfully that it does not believe what it cannot define. In a characteristic paragraph, Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton writes:

> Much of our modern difficulty, in religion and other things, arises merely from this, that we confuse the word "indefinable" with the word "vague." If someone speaks of a spiritual fact as indefinable, we promptly picture something misty, a cloud with indeterminate edges. However, this is no rare event in commonplace logic. The thing that cannot be defined is the first thing; the primary fact. It is our arms and legs, our pots and pans, that are indefinable. The indefinable is the indisputable. The man next door is indefinable, because he is too actual to be defined, and there are some to whom spiritual things have the same fierce and practical proximity; some to whom God is too actual to be defined.

The point is that knowledge and mystery not only exist side by side, but that the comprehensible issues directly from the incomprehensible. Jesus was trying to say something like this when he said to Nicodemus: "The wind bloweth where it listeth. Thou hearest the sound thereof but thou canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth." In a word then, both in science and in religion, mystery does not invalidate the fact.

There is another point at which the similarity of science and theology is striking. To each there are two distinct departments; the first is investigation, and the second is theory. Science is not a sum total of approved facts; that would make of science a rubbish heap. Bricks and mortar never made a house. Theory is absolutely necessary to enable us to make our way among the facts. The theory serves to explain and utilize existing facts, and to enable the scientist to infer the existence of other facts.

A large proportion of scientific discoveries has been the direct outcome of imaginative theory. As Professor Peabody puts it, science has progressed by a series of well-ordered guesses. It is well to remember that the approved facts of science never change; but that the approved theories are changing every hour. This is where a great deal of our difficulty resides. We feel that we must accept not only the facts which have been demonstrated, but also the theories which the reigning scientific authorities pronounce correct.

There has grown up consequently in the field of science what Sir Oliver Lodge calls the "orthodoxy" of science. This is a perfectly natural process, but the dangers of it have been amply demonstrated during the past few years. It was not long ago, for example, that the atom was the inviolable unit of matter. In fact and in conception nothing could serve to reduce the atom

to lower terms. It has become our mournful experience to stand by while the atom has been shattered into infinitesimal pieces. First it was the ion, and then the corpuscle, and now the vortex which have done the nefarious business. And yet science has not been shaken; in its permanent department where the facts are, there has been no disturbance. It is only in the disposition that confusion has run riot. The types are all intact. The excited compositors have only spelled the word wrong. That can easily be changed. As Professor Peabody puts it, there is a difference between seeing the fact and seeing into the fact.

It is well to remember two things in this connection; first, there are large untraversed areas in the universe which will serve to throw light in the future upon our present problems. We must patiently await the results of their exploration. It is impossible to form final conclusions on insufficient evidence. Science faces the future with heroic hopefulness, and the long list of rejected theories which mark her onward march is only an added evidence of her confidence in reaching the final goal of truth.

The second thing to remember is that investigation and generalization are two different functions. It is rarely that a single man is expert in both. The qualities which enable a man to plan and to await the unfolding of phenomena may not be the same qualities which would be invoked in setting a universe in order. The miner and the minter call for two different disciplines. These two things, therefore, are necessary to science: fact and theory. The fact is God's, and never changes; the theories are man's, and change incessantly.

It is precisely the same in the field of theology. To be specific, in the Christian system there are certain facts which must be accounted for. Whether it can be proved historically or not that Jesus ever lived, it is certain that the cult of Jesus has existed for many centuries. It is also indisputable that members of this cult exhibit certain definite effects of their faith. Changes of character, changes in temperament, direction given to careers, and the implanting or educing of certain virtues and activities have certainly taken place. The theologian attempts to collate all the facts in the history of the cult, and in the development of the experiences of its members. As a result of this effort he has formulated a system of doctrine derived from the Bible, the history of the church, Christian literature, and the experiences of Christians. This is his theory of the whole matter. When this theory is accepted by the Christian church at large, it becomes the orthodoxy of the church. As is well known, there have been many orthodoxies of the past widely differing among themselves. It means much for us to see that here, as in science, the facts and the theories are of different orders. The facts of Christian truth are God's, and cannot be altered. The disposition of these facts into theories is man's, and may change at any time. The tragedy of our church life has always been that Christians have been unwilling to dissever the truth from the authoritative statement of the truth.

As in science, the rejected theories mark the advance of thought. Here

again the case is no different with theology from what it is with science. The fact is that neither can afford to be dogmatic. Both must prove all things, hold fast to that which is good, while steadfastly setting their faces toward the light. Is there not hope then that we may see at no distant date something that answers to a scientific theology?

So far I have tried to show the similarity of basis and method, which theology bears to science. It now becomes the supreme question whether theology deals with realities as confessedly science does.

Modern psychology has furnished an entirely new apologetic for the Christian faith. Heretofore the Christian faith has been vindicated largely upon a basis of history, and the authenticity of its Scriptures. If the Bible could be proved true, Christians felt secure. If not, there would always hang a dismal cloud over the faith. For this reason the modern critical and historical methods wrought havoc among the faithful. The storm raged around such strongholds as inspiration, authenticity, historicity, etc.

It cannot at this moment be said with absolute assurance that every one of the questions raised in regard to these things has been satisfactorily answered. Mathematical demonstration is as far away as it ever was. There are, however, certain facts and forces at work in Christianity which operate much after the fashion of scientific facts and forces. These are embodied in certain doctrines which have become dynamic. We have seen that comprehensible reactions may emanate from an inscrutable mystery. For example, while chemistry is mathematically accurate upon one side, namely, that of its activities, the source of its activities remains as deep a mystery as ever. We know that certain substances will unite to form certain other substances. Hydrogen, oxygen, and sulphur, under different conditions, will form certain other compounds. We have yet to explain, however, the mysterious thing called affinity which makes these substances behave in this fashion.

The doctrine of the incarnation which declares that in some way God became man is as utterly unthinkable a philosophical proposition as could well be conceived. And yet, are there not far-reaching and definite reactions that can be traced as a result of the belief of this doctrine upon the human race? Grant that we have called the thing by a wrong name, is it not one of the immediate ideas which have contributed to the spiritual evolution of mankind? Is it not significant also that the high-water mark of this ancient doctrine was reached in the person of Jesus, and that the history of Christianity, and of its influence upon mankind, is directly traceable to this belief that God came in human flesh?

It would be hard to conceive of a universal religion such as Christianity claims to be without this central figure of Deity. Let us assume that no satisfactory philosophical theory of the deity of Jesus will ever be forthcoming. If we reject all orthodox views of the deity of Jesus, we only magnify the miracle, not dispose of it. If Jesus was only a man, it is conceded that he drew more heavily than all others upon the fund of deity, and became the "way-shower" for humanity. If he does not stand between God and us, but stands with

us in the common quest, this is to bring God even nearer. At all events, however analyzed, the person of Jesus has served to stimulate immeasurably man's faith in the dealings of God with him. The fact of belief in the incarnation and the fact of its influence have been amply demonstrated. Here is a dynamic idea which, like wisdom, is justified of her children. The identity of God with his creation is the most tremendous of all facts. Is it, therefore, fair that the scientist should cause the Christian fact to wait outside until a theory be produced which shall satisfy him as to its reasonableness? The scientific world at this moment is busy with radioactive substances. As usual the facts precede the theories. No school of science at this moment can give an adequate theory of radioactivity. No one questions the reality of radium, however.

Much the same thing can be said about the cross of Jesus. No thoughtful man is entirely satisfied with any theory of the atonement. After all are enunciated there are large areas still untraversed. There are other ways to prove its validity than the merely philosophical. Whatever may be said as to the impossiblity of this or that explanation of the atonement, the fact is that through the centuries millions of sinful men have found relief from sin at the foot of the cross. The whole outlook of millions of men has been changed under the dominance of the sacrificial idea. All that is involved in love and sacrifice is here focused, and to be in its atmosphere means transformation.

Let science prove, if it can, that every dogmatic theory concerning the atonement is futile. Science can never render nugatory the fact of the operation of this idea upon the race. As in science, so in theology, out of the mystery comes the certainty.

In the same way the fact of regeneration may be treated. Modern psychology is doing notable work in just this department of theology. It is gradually deducing for us a dynamic theology which will justify the ways of God to man. We are beginning to see then that there is a law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, making us free from the law of sin and death. The new apologetic undertakes single-handed to prove the essential contentions of Christianity. It believes in the commerce between God and the human soul, which is religion. Its primary concern is just here. It will some day, I verily believe, prove in a new way that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.

The ultimate foundations of the Christian faith will not rest in history or in the Bible alone. Both of these will be seen to be expressions of something larger and more vital proceeding from the very heart of the Father himself. The Bible is not the sole ground of our confidence. Christian history does much, but traditions are never safe. By the new apologetic, in addition to the assurance and comfort which come from the Bible and history, there is the more intimate and satisfying contact with God through vitalized ideas.

There is, as Professor James says, "a certain important deliverance in which religions all appear to meet. It consists of two parts, first an uneasiness and second its solution. The uneasiness reduced to its simplest terms is a sense

that there is *something wrong about us* as we naturally stand. The solution is a sense that *we are saved from the wrongness* by making proper connection with the higher powers." Are these higher powers merely extensions of our subconscious selves? Professor James answers: "That which produces effects within another reality must be termed a reality itself, so I feel as if we had no philosophic excuse for calling the unseen or mystical world unreal." The actual "inflow of energy in the faith-state and the prayer-state" is a phenomenon as tangible as any reaction in the physical universe.

If theology, therefore, can in the senses I have named be fairly called scientific, it becomes at once imperative that we find, at all cost, a scientific method by which to give it expression. A scientific attitude toward the Scriptures will be the first step in the process. The theologian has usually approached the Scriptures from the side of speculative reason. The truth vindicated itself in idea. God revealed himself in a system of thought by which he justified his ways to men. Facts merely pointed to the ideas, at most were but the symbols of ideas. The facts would perish but the system would remain. The reality, therefore, was intellectual. Now, it is perfectly clear that the early church did not so regard the matter at all. In the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods Christianity was intensely phenomenal. There seemed to be for the most part utter disregard of the reasons why or for, in the tremendous happenings which were absorbing the attention. A dynamic had been released among men and the chief thing was this fact and its reactions. The blind man whose cure was wrought by Jesus, and the apostle Paul, in spite of his large theological efforts, occupied common ground in the appreciation of values. The former was intellectually satisfied by the *fact*—"Whereas I was blind—now I see." The latter in the first chapter of I Cor. boldly announces the failure of philosophy and declares that God had made foolish the wisdom of the world. To him, the fact verified the idea. "To us who are being saved it is the power of God." "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." The clinching arguments in the eighth chapter of Romans are all facts. It is "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus"; the sonship of men is pragmatical—"as many as are led by the spirit of God." "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God," the whole argument ending in the glorious climax; "If God is for us, who is against us!" The apostolic method consisted, to use the words of Professor James, in the "attitude of looking away from first things, principles, categories, supposed necessities; and of looking toward last things, fruits, consequences, facts." To the theologian as to the scientist the starting-point is the phenomenon. Here is a point of departure beyond which lie alluring areas of freshness for the theologian, the preacher, and the Christian. The Scriptures abound in passages which are easily susceptible of sane, scientific treatment. Sometimes the New Testament writers use the actual terms which science, centuries later, adopted. Rom. 12:2 is a veritable mine of biological truth. Here are conformity to environment, transformism by combi-

nation of inner as well as outer forces, creative evolution regulated by will, and the fact of God.

The colloquy with Nicodemus reveals the sureness of Jesus in his handling of great subjects. Great scientific principles are uttered repeatedly. If vs. 6, "That which is born of the flesh, etc.," does not set limits to the variation of species, it at least remains for natural evolution to prove the contrary. In spite of Professor Bergson we are not yet quite sure that "we think matter." The new birth of the soul is paralleled by the conversion of soil into plant life. The very fundamental standpoint of science is taken by Jesus—in vs. 8: "The wind bloweth—thou canst not tell." Science declares that it knows forces by the way they act, not by understanding of their essence. Here theology takes its place beside science in frankly admitting its mysteries and stoutly defending their known reactions. Lastly, vs. 21 ought to be inscribed over the entrance of every laboratory in the world: "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." Here is the gospel of experiment, of investigation, the inductive method of the intellect and of the soul. The New Testament is not an academic but a dynamic and phenomenal record of God's dealings with men. Its wisdom and meaning lie in the experiences recorded, not in the system of ideas set forth. If every argument put forth by the writers of the New Testament should fall to the ground in the light of advancing knowledge, it would be but the removal of the drapery which would serve to bring out more clearly the majestic figure of truth. It is not a system of ideas with which we are primarily concerned. It is commerce with God which we must know about. The Bible is nothing if it be not the record of human converse with God. It is not ideas to conceive but relations to maintain. It is Christ in us the hope of glory.

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON
Principal of the University of Chicago High School

Study V. Honesty

Honesty is the foundation upon which the stability of our society rests. The business of the world is chiefly done on a basis of credit and depends upon the fidelity with which contracts are met, often calling for the payment of money many days or months after the goods are delivered. Men deposit their money in banks with full confidence that they will receive it with interest whenever

they desire. Billions of dollars are invested in stocks and bonds of railroad or industrial corporations by persons who have never seen the men to whom they have intrusted their money. The United States Steel Corporation has issued $1,300,000,000 of stocks and bonds which are owned by upward of 300,000 people in every part of the world in amounts varying from less than one hundred to millions of dollars. Only in this way can large business enterprises be carried on. There are many safeguards provided by law to secure the rightful use of money thus invested and to protect the investor against loss. In spite of these losses are often incurred. Are such losses always due to dishonesty?

Nations enter into agreements with each other through treaties. Are these agreements always kept? What would be the effect upon the armies and navies of the world if it were certain that international agreements would be fulfilled? Diplomats represent their governments in the different capitals of the world. It was formerly supposed that an important part of a diplomat's business was to deceive the government to which he was sent. What improvement has taken place in the relation of nations with each other? Discuss the international court at The Hague.

In what ways do the affairs of our daily lives depend upon our confidence in each other? Discuss from this standpoint the grocer and his customer, the physician and his patient, the lawyer and his client, the employer and his workmen. What is accomplished by the pure food laws?

It has repeatedly been said the American aim is "first to get on, then to get honor, and lastly to get honest." Do you think this is true? There is a common saying that "honesty is the best policy." Is this the only reason or the highest reason for being honest?

As honesty is such an important factor in the relations of individuals and groups of individuals with each other, the habit of honesty is one of the most important to acquire. The most common form of honesty has to do with our speech. It is necessary for us to decide first what constitutes telling the truth and telling a lie. Has a person who makes a statement which is untrue but which he believes to be true told a lie? Can a person tell a part of the truth in such a way as to leave a false impression on the hearer? Has he told a lie even though he has said nothing untrue? Give an illustration. Can a person, by exaggeration or otherwise, say what is untrue without deceiving his hearer? Has he told a lie? Give an illustration. Can one tell a lie without speaking at all? How? What, then, is the essential element of a lie?

Is There Such a Thing as a "White" Lie?

Habits of untruthfulness are most likely to be formed in what seem to be small matters. In school, pupils often give evasive or false excuses for tardiness, failure to prepare lessons, or other similar faults, without thinking that they are thus forming habits which will cling to them through life. It is sometimes regarded as something to be boasted over that they have thus deceived the teacher. Can you justify different standards of honesty in dealing with a teacher and with your chum? What do

you think of a teacher or parent who tries to "bluff" you? Does this justify dishonesty on your part? Is a lie ever justifiable? If you think so, give an illustration.

When the telling of the truth may involve others in difficulty, a puzzling situation is often presented. A case which was presented in the *Outlook* recently gave rise to much discussion and difference of opinion. "Good and Bad are two boys attending the same school. One day Bad said to Good, 'I am going to throw a snowball through the window.' Good made no reply. Bad threw the snowball and broke the window, and Good saw him do it. The next morning at school the teacher asked the pupils singly and privately the question, 'Do you know who broke the window?' and 'Who broke the window?' What should Good say when the teacher asked him, 'Do you know who broke the window?' What should Good say when she asked him, 'Who broke the window?' Should the teacher have asked the boys these questions? Should the teacher have the same right as the court in compelling Good to tell?" Was Good in any degree responsible for the broken window? Does the character of the offense involved make any difference in your opinion as to whether one boy should ever tell on another?

Suggestions for further study: How can you best develop the habit of truthfulness for yourself? What can you do to improve the standards of truthfulness among your associates?

Study VI. Honesty—*Continued*

Cheating

Closely allied to truthfulness in speech is honesty in dealing with others in work and sports. This may be seen in the relation of a workman to his employer, of the pupil to his teacher, of one contestant or athletic team to another.

It is all too common in these relations for one to be honest only when under observation. A boy takes the job of distributing handbills about town and throws half of them into the river. Give some other illustration. If you are an employed boy, do you work as hard when your employer or overseer is absent? Is the boy who never intends to earn more than his wages likely to secure promotion? Is the confidence of your employer valuable to you? How can you secure and keep this?

In many schools and colleges students frequently use dishonest methods in the preparation of work and in classroom and examination. There is sometimes real ignorance as to what is dishonest in the preparation of work. Is the use of a "pony" in preparing a Latin lesson dishonest? Can one ever honesty present as his work what he has not done for himself? There is little likelihood of ignorance regarding what constitutes dishonesty in class or examination. Is the person who gives information in an examination equally culpable with the one who receives it? If a teacher is careless or has physical defects which make it difficult for him to detect dishonesty, is dishonesty more excusable? What different persons may be injured by a student's dishonesty in examination? How is each injured? Who receives the greatest injury?

Many colleges conduct examinations on an honor system in which students take the examinations without the supervision of instructors, signing at the close a statement that they have neither received nor given help. Discuss the advantages of this plan. How do you think this would work in your high school?

Athletic contests offer a fertile field for dishonest practices. The intense desire to win sometimes leads to the recruiting of athletes in ways that violate the spirit and even the letter of the requirements for amateur standing. Can there be any justification whatever for the manager or captain who does this? Can an honest boy play on a team on which he knows there is an ineligible player? Can a school respect a teacher who knowingly allows such a thing to occur in his school? Ought a school to be expected to cheer for such a team?

Dishonesty in athletics often consists in evading rules of the game. Coaches sometimes teach players how to break the rules without detection. Is it dishonest to beat the pistol at the start of the race if you can do it successfully? Discuss "dirty" football from the standpoint of winning the game; from the standpoint of good morals. In a baseball game, the batter hits a ball to deep left field and, seeing that the umpire is watching the ball, cuts first base and reaches second successfully. Discuss the ethics involved. Of what value are successful athletic teams to a school? Is victory secured dishonestly valuable or harmful? Does it make any difference whether the dishonesty is detected by the opposing school?

A well-known school had won a big track meet in which many schools had competed. They had reached home with the trophy of victory when it was discovered that one of the boys representing the school had been ineligible. This was not known and was not likely to become known outside the school. But the trophy was returned at once with a statement of the facts and was awarded to the team which had taken second place. That school has a right to be more proud of that trophy which it might have retained than of any of the many which adorn its trophy room. It is a trophy of the honesty of the school. Has your school a tradition for clean and honest sport? If not, what can you do to secure this?

One of the most common forms of deceit is self-deceit. One may sometimes satisfy oneself that an act of dishonesty is honest. In some schools, pledges are required that one is not and will not become a member of a fraternity. Boys break this on the ground that a forced pledge is not binding. Is this so? Members of fraternities, when asked if they are members, sometimes say that they are not on the ground that one may resign and resume membership at will, and that this resignation may be performed mentally. This is, of course, only self-deception, utterly unworthy of an honorable boy. Give some other illustrations of self-deception. Shakespeare placed these words in the mouth of Polonius:

> To thine own self be true
> And it must follow as the night the day
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

Study VII. Property Rights

Regard for the rights of property is an acquired habit. Among animals generally the stronger takes from the weaker. The child naturally takes whatever comes to hand, until taught not to do so. Doubtless primitive man did not differ from the other animals in this respect. But society, through custom and law, has undertaken to safeguard the ownership of property, so that the weak as well as the strong may feel that his property is secure.

We know very well, however, that nations and individuals have often violated these laws. Nations have taken by force the property of other nations or inferior peoples. Discuss the ethics of the treatment which our nation has accorded the Indians; the treatment of the Aztecs by the Spaniards under Cortez. Is sufficient justification found in the fact that a higher civilization has followed the conquest of inferior peoples? In what respects has our possession of the Philippines differed from these two instances?

Each morning's paper tells of defaulting bank cashiers, grafting public officers, or petty thieves brought before courts of law. It is plain that the habit of honesty as regards property must be firmly established to enable us to stand strong against the temptations that confront us in the complex life of business and politics. It is probable that most persons are not detected in the first offense but have formed habits of dishonesty, often with small beginnings the real nature of which was not at the time appreciated. Boys in school, as treasurers of classes or other organizations, are sometimes careless in handling funds. A manager of an athletic team makes personal use of money in his hands, intending to replace it later. At the end of the season, he finds it inconvenient to do this, and rather than acknowledge the fact, he conceals his fault by making a false accounting. Compare his case with that of the cashier who uses funds of his bank for personal investment, intending to replace them later. In what respect do the ethics involved differ whether he restores the funds or not?

People frequently have different standards in dealing with the property of individuals and with that of corporations or of the public at large. Slugs are frequently found in the cash boxes of public telephones. Men deliberately evade the payment of fares in crowded cars. Railroads charge no fare for infants and half-fare for children below a certain age. Parents often thus secure rates for children above the specified ages. Does it make any difference whether the ticket-seller or conductor inquires the child's age? Is one under less obligation to pay the required fare to a railroad than to pay his grocer's bill?

Pupils are likely to use the books or other articles provided by the school less carefully than they would if they were their own. Often there is wanton destruction of school or other public property in the celebration of victories. Can you justify this? Does the fact that many are involved furnish any justification?

Merchants sometimes employ short weights or measures. A clerk often knowingly conceals defects in goods from purchasers. What should an honest boy

do if his employer expects him to do this? Should the fear or certainty that he will lose his job if he refuses make any difference?

In school the term "swiping" is frequently applied to acts which elsewhere would be called "stealing." Articles of clothing, athletic material, books, etc., are often taken by those who know that they do not belong to them. School lockers are sometimes forcibly entered and articles are taken from them.

Members of athletic teams frequently collect "souvenirs" from dining-cars, hotels, and schools visited, and school boys' rooms often include such spoils among their decorations. Can any other term than "stealing" properly be applied to such acts? Someone has said of students that "nothing is absolutely safe that is not nailed down." What do you think of this statement?

In the famous Rugby School in England there are no lockers in the gymnasium and each boy's equipment is hung on a peg. In the cricket clubhouse the valuable togs for playing the game are placed in leather bags, unlocked but marked with the owner's initials, and arranged on long tables in an open room. It is evident that the knowledge that an article belongs to another boy is sufficient to assure its safety. Would your football togs be safe if similarly placed in your school gymnasium? If not, how do you account for the difference between your school and Rugby? What do you think would improve the condition? Do you think that boys in school are as honest as their fathers in business?

Probably boys fall into this practice thoughtlessly. But habits are formed from what often appear small beginnings. What are some of the possible results which might come from the practice of "swiping"? Would it not be most desirable to secure in your school such a clearly defined code of honor that no one would think, under any circumstances, of taking what he knew was not his own? What can you do to establish such a noble tradition?

Study VIII. Gambling and Betting

The choice of goal in a football game is decided by the toss of a coin. How does this differ from matching pennies to decide who shall pay for the ice cream sodas? Show how in athletic games any advantage that comes to the winner of the toss is equalized as the contest proceeds. It is evident that chance is an essential element of gambling but that chance enters into many situations in life which do not involve gambling at all.

When you buy a pair of shoes or a baseball and bat, you expect that the merchant will give you a fair return for your money, charging you a reasonable profit above what the goods cost him. In legitimate business both the buyer and the seller render an equivalent for value received. Compare with this the cases of the loser and winner in a game of cards played for money or in a wager over the result of a football game. Has the winner at cards or of a bet given to the loser any equivalent for the money which he wins? What then are the two essential elements of gambling?

Experience seems to show that chance adds zest to almost any situation in life. It is because of this apparently natural instinct that gambling makes its appeal.

Boys are sure to be confronted with apparently harmless situations that involve the principle of gambling. The making of wagers of candy, matching coins for sodas, etc., are familiar occurrences. In pitching pennies or playing marbles "for keeps," does the fact that the winner has greater skill have anything to do with deciding whether there is gambling involved? In most pool rooms the loser pays for the game. Is this gambling? What equivalent has the loser received more than the winner that he should pay for? If the winner has more skill, should the loser pay him for this? Can you justify this on the basis of good sportsmanship? Discuss prizes at card parties from this standpoint. Do you think of any other common practices in which the principle of gambling is involved?

Since the element of chance is naturally interesting and so many opportunities abound for falling into forms of petty gambling which may easily lead to confirmed habits, we should consider why gambling is wrong in itself and the habit one to be avoided. In the first place the practice of receiving something for which one does not give a fair return destroys one's sense of the value of money and of the labor by which real value is produced. Jenks says: "The gambling habit is opposed to thrift and no community can prosper whose members are not thrifty." The habit of gambling once acquired is likely to take so much of a man's time and thought that he neglects his legitimate occupation with the almost certain loss of his earnings. Dickens in *The Old Curiosity Shop* has given in the grandfather of little Nell a most pathetic illustration of the depths to which the gambling habit may reduce a man.

There are many who declare that their gambling is done wholly among friends and that the stakes never represent more than a fair return for the pleasure obtained. But the habit once established, it is difficult to limit the amount of money one will devote to it or to confine it to one's friends. Playing with professional gamblers soon follows where the chances are certain to be in favor of the house or gambler even though the game may be honestly played. Ruin is almost sure to follow. The records of Monte Carlo, if faithfully preserved, would show many suicides of those who have been made desperate by their losses.

Gambling is permitted freely in many countries in Europe, and is openly shared by nobility and people. What do you know about the Derby? Monte Carlo? In this country there has been developing rapidly a strong public opinion against gambling as opposed to the common good, and it has been gradually restricted or prohibited by law. The Louisiana lottery flourished until a few years ago when it was denied the privilege of the mails and was forced to cease its operations. Race-track gambling has been prevented by law in New York and other states. Gambling in any form is forbidden by law in many states and cities. What are the laws regarding gambling in your state and town? Are they enforced?

Suggestions for discussion: The buying and selling of stocks "on margin" on the stock exchange; the slot machine in the cigar store; guessing contests at fairs or bazaars; betting on interschool games.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. II

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH.D.
Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago

It cannot be too often insisted that the religious educator must not separate himself from the so-called secular educator and imagine that he has a task by itself. In the books we have already studied on religious education there has been constant insistence upon the unity of the educational process. All that the students of educational psychology and pedagogy have learned is valuable for us, and this not only because we can take over from secular education principles and methods useful in religious education, but because real educators have always conceived their task as a spiritual undertaking. We therefore turn to a group of books from the field of general education in order to get the groundwork for our religious task.

We consider—

Thorndike, *Education: A First Book.*
Mark, *The Unfolding of Personality as the Chief Aim in Education.*
Horne, *Psychological Principles of Education.*
Sisson, *The Essentials of Character.*
James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology: and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals.*

Everyone interested in the educational work of the church wants to know something about education in general and what the great school system of America is about. This is secured in Thorndike's *Education.* He entitles it "A First Book," intending it as an introduction to the subject, especially for students in college and normal school. The minister will find here very little reference to his own peculiar problems, but a presentation of educational theory and practice which will give him an entirely new view of his church work.

Thorndike defines education very broadly as the production and prevention of changes in human beings. Then arises the important question, What is the aim of the changes that we seek to make? A long chapter devoted to a discussion of eleven different aims of education with a consideration of the significant values in each affords an excellent survey of this aspect of educational theory. Happiness, service, morality, complete living are evidently aims which religious education would have to take into account.

A discussion of the being to be educated is a simple treatment of the fundamental facts of psychology, and is especially valuable for its presentation of the significance of human instincts and predispositions as determining the educational process; "the eventual nature which is desired for man has to be built up from his original nature." The dis-

cussion of the Means of Education, dealing with the values of the school studies, etc., may seem far away from church interest, yet the means available for the religious educator are much the same as those which the ordinary school employs. And the question of employing men and women as teachers has an important bearing on our problem. May the voluntary principle in church teaching make it possible to secure a higher type of man than can ordinarily be obtained by the public school?

One of the most important subjects in education is that of methods of teaching. Here the Sunday school is notably deficient. The brief and pointed discussion in this book of each of the current methods will prepare for the more special treatment by James and lead to a careful study of standard pedagogical works.

It will be noted that Thorndike does not expect of the school any very definite contribution to moral development. He is concerned with efficiency results. Indeed, he insists that we must not expect too much when we require one teacher, poorly paid, to have charge of forty children. This is undoubtedly a very practical way of looking at the facts, but it is greatly to be hoped that the experts in education who are doing so much to improve its efficiency will not fail to insist that efficiency must be expressed in terms of character.

The very title of Mark's book, *The Unfolding of Personality as the Chief Aim in Education*, indicates his conception of educational endeavor. The goal which he holds forth is a certain high type of personality. What is this but moral and religious education? But to the author this aspect of the case is so self-evident that he does not argue it at all. He is, rather, concerned with the method of attaining such an end and the emphasis of his book is therefore on the word "unfolding." There is a highest individual character toward which each of us may progress, and it is the business of education to help the progress. This involves the recognition of the native human tendencies and introduces us at once to the ever-interesting question of heredity. In the popular mind there is much confusion on this subject. Some people think of heredity superficially, as if it meant the various "ways" in which a child "takes after" its parents and grandparents. Others, with a certain awe of fatalism, think of it as some predestined course imposed on the individual from his forbears, from which he has no escape. Still others, with faith in the salvability of the human being, while regarding heredity as a certain possible handicap, insist that environment is more than heredity. Putting aside the question whether the acquired characteristics of parents, either in skill or morality or vice, can be transmitted, which our present knowledge would answer in the negative, the most fundamental fact about heredity is that it is a great racial endowment and that we come into the world with a large number of native tendencies that develop spontaneously and form the basis of life and character. It is commonly thought that the animals act by instinct and man by intelligence, and that instinct is therefore a negligible factor in human education. But if instinct be defined as inborn tendencies toward specific modes of behavior, then man has more instincts than any other creature and

is more highly organized for behavior. Mark discusses the human instincts in three divisions: (1) unlearned reactions, in which we trace little more than modes or ways of *behaving;* (2) unlearned reactions, which have large and characteristic accompaniments of *feeling;* (3) unlearned reactions, which seem to have the gaining of *knowledge* as their most direct aim.

Among the first he includes the instincts to suck, bite, chew, grasp, point, cry, smile, ask by gesture or by sounds expressive of desire, grip, cling, climb, walk, and, later, to hunt, fight, acquire, emulate, imitate, play. Among the second, fear, anger, affection, sex, inner freedom, sympathy, reverence, dependence, surprise, and wonder. Among the third, curiosity, attention, retention, discrimination, assimilation, apperception, association. This great array of spontaneous powers would seem to imply that if man were simply let alone he would come to himself, as for the most part the animal does. But even the animal learns from experience, and with man instinct blends more and more with experience. Thus arises the opportunity of the educator. It is for him to understand the nature of the spontaneous natural tendencies, the laws of the mental process which arises from the blending of instinct and experience, and so to walk in harmony with these as to assist in the unfolding of personality.

Mark discusses, in chaps. vi–ix, the laws of this mental process with their educational implications. Insisting that mental process works itself out in action, he finds the chief educational responsibility in affording opportunity for effective behavior.

In the last chapter on "Intuitional and Supra-rational Elements in Experience" he has a most suggestive argument upon the relation of our consciousness to the Higher Consciousness, "the touch of the Higher Reality is upon us from the first; genetically we are partakers of the divine nature." Thus all true education becomes religious as it is conducted in the spirit of a great faith.

In his *Psychological Principles of Education*, Horne announces himself as endeavoring to be the middleman between the psychologist and the teacher, "taking theoretical descriptions of pure psychology and transforming them into educational principles for the teacher." Adopting the threefold aspect of human consciousness as the divisions of his work, he treats of intellectual education, or educating the mind to know, emotional education, or educating the mind to feel, moral education, or educating the mind to will, and then adds religious education, or educating the spirit in man. Of course these are not four independent processes, but there is a certain value in the separate treatment. The first chapters of the Introduction, in which the author pleads for a science of education, will not so much interest the minister as the later ones in which the very practical problems of the qualifications of the teacher, the nature of educational psychology, and the theory of formal discipline are discussed.

In the treatment of intellectual education will be found presented all those subjects upon which the religious teacher ought to be informed: the education of the senses, the means by which new truth is apprehended, the nature of memory

and the possibilities of its cultivation, the importance of imagination, induction, and deduction.

The most valuable part of the book is that dealing with the education of the feelings, for the reason that the place of the emotions in education, even in religious education, is so little understood. Indeed, one might be inclined to say that feelings cannot be educated, that they are beyond our reach. Of course, Horne does not mean that we can isolate a feeling and then develop it. But insisting upon the unity of the educational endeavor, he shows how large a place feeling has, and may have, in connection with the very curriculum which seems to be concerned with intellect and will. Here comes in the consideration of pleasure and pain, of the control of the coarser emotions, of the altruistic feelings with the methods by which they might be inspired, of the value of art and aesthetic appreciation. We have often thought of emotion in religion as concerned with certain ecstatic experiences, but this is a very small part of the place of feeling in the noblest life.

Just as we educate the entire personality and not the feelings as such, so the will cannot be isolated for special training. Voluntary action never takes place apart from ideas and feelings, and yet, providing we never lose sight of this interdependence, the development of voluntary action has a history of its own. It proceeds from native tendencies, such as imitation, response to suggestion, and advances through the formation of habit, through play of interest and effort, through the development of attention, to conscious moral choice.

Horne's last chapter is devoted to religious education, and is an endeavor to show that all education can be consciously related to the child's sense of God. His practical suggestions here regarding religious training appropriate to the various periods of life are excellent, but he is confusing when he speaks of "the religious nature" with which children are born. The confusion is evident when he discusses the religion of childhood, which turns out to be just such a normal development as he has already outlined in the previous chapters, having nothing to do with a separate religious nature. His treatment of religious education in the home and church is not especially significant; but he has some wise words on religion in the public school. However, his thesis that the Bible can have a *devotional* and not an *academic* use in the public schools is open to serious question.

The preceding books are too difficult for the ordinary Sunday-school teacher to read and the minister will desire a work that is psychologically accurate and at the same time simple and untechnical which he may put into the hands of parents and teachers. He will find this in *The Essentials of Character* by Sisson. The book is a treatment of the aim of moral education. The author lays the basis where all scientific educational theory must begin in the native tendencies of the human being. He does not consider so many of these tendencies as Mark, confining himself to those most fundamental for character. He then undertakes to show how education must treat those native tendencies in order to bring about desirable results in character. Proceeding thus from the given instinctive elements, he considers

the development of dispositions, habits, tastes, personal ideals, conscience, the social ideal. His sane and genial treatment of such problems as obedience, thoughtfulness, truthfulness, aesthetic appreciation, good reading, courtesy, bad habits will be found very suggestive. The chapter on religion is chiefly valuable for its insistence upon religion as the essence of character. Of course the author does not attempt to discuss the methods of providing for the religious development.

A really great book is James's *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*. If a man can read only one book in this field let it be this one. James has the rare combination of great scholarship and a lucid and interesting style. The book is not difficult reading, being well within the comprehension of the intelligent churchman, and ministers would be wise to take it up with teacher-training classes, helping their Sunday-school workers to understand the discussion. We must seek to lead our teachers away from the idea that pedagogy is a set of ready-made tricks for the purpose of interesting pupils, and help them to grasp a few fundamental principles of teaching on the basis of which they will be able to make their own methods for each lesson.

James discusses the native and acquired tendencies. He has chapters on Habit, Association of Ideas, Interest, Attention, Memory, Acquisition of Ideas, Apperception, the Will. In a more popular manner he presents in this discussion the positions which are more technically treated in his larger works on psychology. This is, therefore, an admirable opportunity of securing the gist of the pedagogical implications of those works.

James is speaking in these lectures to day-school teachers, but the inevitable moral character of education is evident on every page of the discussion. Habit, interest, attention, association of ideas, voluntary action are moral through and through, and there can be no education that is merely non-moral in its quality.

It may be added incidentally that the principles discussed by James belong quite as much to the psychology of preaching as to that of teaching.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. In what respects are the principles and methods of the day school applicable to the Sunday school?
2. How far must the religious educator take account of the human instincts?
3. How far can the church balance the predominantly feminine element in our educational system?
4. What peculiar opportunities does the church afford for emotional education?
5. What is the rational position to take on the question of religion and of religious instruction in the public schools?
6. In what sense may religious development involve the breaking of good habits?

SOME FURTHER WORKS

Spencer, *Education*.
Thorndike, *The Original Nature of Man*.
Horne, *The Philosophy of Education*.
O'Shea, *Education as Adjustment*.
King, *Social Aspects of Education*.
Dewey, *How We Think*.
McMurry, *The Method of the Recitation*.
E. C. Wilm, *The Culture of Religion*.

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS[1]

The general suggestions to the leader under the previous study are equally forceful in connection with the study for the coming month. It need only be repeated that the province of the leader is to help the members of the group to see and to appreciate those things which are not obvious to the untrained reader of the Gospels. Specifically, in this case, to help the group to see what features of the Gospel of Luke are traceable to a different personality from that of the writer of the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Mark, and to note his different purpose and point of view. The Gospel itself is only less interesting than the one which will constitute the study of a later month called by the name of John the disciple. Specific programs are as follows:

Program I

Leader: The person and purpose of the author of the Gospel of Luke. It will be interesting to consider in this connection the state of medical knowledge in the first century, and the possible interest of a physician in Jesus as a healer. To enable the class to see all that lies back of the work of the first and second day will be helpful at this point:

Members: (1) Luke's use of the stories of the birth and childhood of Jesus and a comparison of these stories with that of Matthew; (2) Luke's representation of Jesus and his fellow-townsmen in Nazareth and Capernaum; (3) Luke's representation of the relations between Jesus and John the Baptist; (4) Luke's picture of the intercourse of Jesus with his disciples after the transfiguration and upon the journey from the North back to Jerusalem.

Subject for discussion: A brief presentation of several parables of Jesus and a discussion by the class of their literary form and their interpretation in terms of modern life.

Program II

Leader: The personality of Jesus in religious and social life as presented by Luke, differentiating this presentation from the impression given by Mark and Matthew.

Members: (1) Luke's presentation of the kingdom of God and the cost and significance of membership in it; (2) some indications that Luke's Gospel was addressed primarily to Gentiles; (3) sayings of Jesus peculiar to Luke; (4) Luke's addition to Mark's story of the trial and death of Jesus; (5) Luke's additions to Mark's resurrection story.

Subject for discussion: Did the writers of the first three Gospels seek chiefly to induce people to live as Jesus lived, or to believe in him as a unique personality?

REFERENCE READING

Burton, *A Short Introduction to the Gospels*, chaps. iii, iv; Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (this book should be read in its entirety if possible); Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament;* Wernle, *The Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus;* Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, chap. ii; Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 203–88; Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus;* Jülicher, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 329–83; Peake, *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 101–24; Burton and Mathews, *Constructive Studies in the Life of Christ*, chap. i, and see Luke sections under all chapters; *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, volume on Luke.

Read from Hastings, four-volume and one-volume *Dictionary of the Bible*, and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, articles, The Gospels, Luke the Evangelist, and Gospel of Luke, Text of the New Testament, New Testament, New Testament Canon.

[1] The suggestions relate to the seventh month's work, the student's material for which appears in the *Biblical World* for March and may be obtained in pamphlet reprints for use with classes. Address: THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE, The University of Chicago.

CURRENT OPINION

The Faith of Tolstoy

"Tolstoy's Religion" is the subject treated by E. A. Thurber in the January number of the *Open Court*. It seems that Tolstoy was not always the best judge of himself. Men who, like him, have a stormy imagination and a searching mind are apt to overstate and, in a kind of intellectual fury, to fail to account for such influences that in spite of them work in their lives. Tolstoy, in his very old age, seemed inclined to declare that his religion owed much to non-Christian teaching, like Krishna, Buddha, Socrates, Epictetus. But, after all, he drew very little inspiration from these sages of the world: the source of his religious experience was the Bible, the influence which brought about what may be called his final conversion is the character of Jesus. Mr. Thurber calls Tolstoy a modern St. Augustine. Like the great Bishop of Hippo, he felt intensely the power of passions, like him he wrote a book dealing with his experiences, and he called it *My Confession*. Although Tolstoy was excommunicated by the Orthodox church, he was far from being the kind of man who will water down his belief and make all religion consist in "good works." Tolstoy did not belong to the moralists: for him good works are simply the natural offshoot of faith.

The Mission of Judaism in America

Rabbi J. S. Kornfeld, in the *Forum*, December, 1913, in an answer to Israel Zangwill's statement: "Thousands of the rising generation have never seen phylacteries, or carried a palm branch, or sat in a tabernacle. . . . . The bulk of American Jewry know more of Christian Science than of the Talmud or even the Mosaic Code," contends that true Judaism does not consist in the observance of outward forms. Judaism in essence, according to Rabbi Kornfeld, is a civilizing force. Its supreme mission in the world is to be the savior of society. It considers justice as the highest attribute of God and wishes this attribute to dominate all society. To accomplish this social mission Judaism adjusts itself to the changing conditions of life: it casts off the old forms and assumes the new.

The great problems of our age relate to the questions of international peace, of the social evil, and of capital and labor. Rabbi Kornfeld is confident that Judaism, adhering as it does to the social messages of the great Old Testament prophets, is a solvent, if not the solvent, of these perplexing problems. In view of this society-saving quality of Judaism, what the Jews in America need most of all to do is to practically work out the social principles of their religion. In so doing Judaism will in reality become the savior of society. And thus will Rabbi Kornfeld's vision for Judaism be realized.

Salvation and Mysticism

Miss Evelyn Underhill studies "Mysticism and the Doctrine of the Atonement" in the January number of the *Interpreter*. There seems to be incompatibility between the conception of atonement and the process of mysticism: on the one hand, if we conceive of man saved because the divine life humiliated itself and sacrificed itself for humanity can we, on the other hand, think that man is being saved by a process of personal and individual growth through a progressive union with God? These two ideas are two sides of a greater whole. The one-sided idea of the death of Christ on Calvary being the all-important factor in our salvation, redeeming us once for all, has no use for mysticism, but the wonderful doctrine of the Incarnation is not in opposition to mysticism;

far from it. It can be understood in all its fulness and beauty by mystics only. Paul, the greatest of all Christian mystics, the founder of Christian theology, is supremely the theologian of the Atonement. He feels himself, he knows himself, to be part of "the body of Christ," and then he tries to reason and understand where he stands. He has a vision of something supreme, an enormous uplift achieved for and in the human race: it is not a dream because he knows it to be so in him, the mystic Paul. Even his eschatology is connected with this: Christ who has triumphed in his soul will reign over the whole realm of creation, this being the supreme victory of the incarnate life. Faith is a mystical vision, love is a mystical act. This is why there is no opposition between the mystic ideals and the atoning idea. Without the principle of solidarity which the Atonement expresses, the mystics would be isolated and their experiences meaningless except for themselves. Without the great mystical self-donation in love the Atonement would be only history, a fact of the past having no influence in the development of the world. Without the mystical vision of faith the Atonement would remain a dry doctrine and could never become a part of our religious consciousness.

Is the Church of England the Church of the English People?

In the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1914, Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, who holds a living in England, writes on "The Failure of the Church of England." We often hear from other quarters of the increase of the church in England, of her revived zeal, and of her more efficient grasp of modern questions. It seems, however, that the inadequate number of clergy and the decrease of church attendance, very marked in all English religious bodies, points to a weakening of the influence of the church as well as of Nonconformity.

Mr. Blunt does not think that the average Englishman is upset by theological or academical questions. Intellectual difficulties may account for 5 per cent at most of the cases of indifference to the church. Any parish priest will tell you that the enemies of the religious observance are late hours, the pipe, the motor car, the bicycle, and the golf club. There is very little opposition to the church; her dogmas and sacraments are not attacked; but this is because the church is not understood, and people think that she is too immaterial and impractical. Men will willingly acknowledge that the church is an ethical agency and wields a powerful influence for good, but the moral fiber has slackened among all classes so that the discipline of the church has fallen into disuse, not because it is ecclesiastical, but merely because it is discipline. On the other hand the clergy have compromised too much with the present attitude of the world toward morality. We may have Christianized the world a little, says Mr. Blunt, but we have permitted the world to secularize the church a great deal more.

It would be good policy to draw a clearer line of demarkation between the church and the world and to proclaim the value of dogma as a necessary expression of the corporate mind of the church. The notion of being a church which claims every baptized Englishman and gives him a right to belong to the church and no duty to obey her has not worked well and ought to give place to a more "catholic" conception. Let the laity be taught what the church is, and in order to attain this end let the clergy be well fitted intellectually. They may have very few occasions of using scientific arguments with gainsayers, but their deeper—and to a great extent hidden—knowledge of the facts of science and philosophy which underlie the world will tell upon their teaching and make it more effective.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

The Testimony of Soldiers to Missions

The Layman's Missionary Movement of Great Britain recently held its first conference in Buxton with a series of enthusiastic sessions in which the most effective speakers were drawn from native Christians of Africa and India. The conference was marked also by the frank testimony of officers of both the army and the navy, who in their service abroad had been convinced by actual demonstration of the value of Christian missions. This was decidedly a new note. The prevailing sentiment of the convention was voiced by one of the speakers when he said, "It is our privilege to see that never again shall there be a generation of men who do not believe in foreign missions."

Missionary Progress in West Africa

In West Africa there are considerable additions to the Christian church, except in the old mission fields of Sierra-Leone and Gambia. On the Gold Coast the Methodists had nearly 3,000 baptisms and in Togo the German missions among the Ewe report 1,500 baptisms. The Church Missionary Society missions in Southern Nigeria are very prosperous. The C.M.S. Book-Room at Lagos has become self-supporting, and the profits made on the sales of English books and stationery have been utilized in publishing books for Christian propaganda in the Yoruba language. A native clergyman visited Palestine and Egypt last year. After his return to Lagos, the Mohammedans crowded in the church to hear news of the Holy Land. The publications of the Christian Literature Society for India have proved very useful for work among Mohammedans in West Africa. The Sudan United Mission under the leadership of Dr. Kumm plans a chain of stations from the Niger to the Nile, and has sent out 18 new missionaries this year and hopes to begin mission work in the French Soudan where no evangelical missionary has ever worked except an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. On the other hand, Islam grows very rapidly and will make Christian propaganda more difficult in the future.

A New Mohammedan Sect

Islam assumes in West Africa special characteristics. It is more dependent than elsewhere on the virtue of charms; it is very often less strict in the matter of abstinence from drink. In Senegambia a new sect called the Morites has arisen. The Morites are men who give themselves to a marabout (a Mohammedan priest, if such a word can be used). They bring to him all their earnings; he treats them like his slaves. So far, there was nothing new. But now, the Morites believe that when they have become consecrated to such a saintly leader, his prayers and good deeds avail for them, so that the priest will pray for them, fast for them, deserve Allah's blessing for them, while they will work for him; it does not matter very much whether they will fulfil their duties of a Mussulman or not. It can be seen easily how this movement, while it brings ease and prosperity to some teachers of Islam who trade on their sanctity (a sanctity of a low type), destroys in fact the whole system of Islam. Sincere Moslems of Senegambia are greatly concerned with the dangers involved in the present movement.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

"Father-and-Son" Campaign

One of the results of the recent Father-and-Son Movement started by the Young Men's Christian Association of Cleveland, Ohio, was a proclamation issued shortly before the holidays by Mayor Baker of that city which urged all fathers in the city to spend New Year's Day in company with their sons and by corollary all sons in company with their fathers. He said: "If we can as a city people begin the new year with the resolve that our sons shall be more our companions and our fathers more our comrades, it will add both to the sweetness of our private life and to the value of our citizenship."

Bishop Williams on Union

Preaching from a Baptist pulpit in New York City during the recent Episcopal General Convention, Bishop Williams of Michigan, says the *Missionary Review of the World* for December, used these words: "Still more does the pressure for union come upon us from the mission fields at home and abroad. What do our denominational differences mean to the Chinese and Japanese? This is illustrated in their attempt to translate our denominational names into the Chinese language. The Baptist church becomes the 'Big Wash church,' the Presbyterian church, the 'church of the Ruling Old Men,' while the Protestant Episcopal church is rendered into 'the church of the Kicking Overseers.'"

The Sunday-School Council of Evangelical Denominations

The fourth annual meeting of the representatives of the publishing and Sunday-school interests of the thirty-one denominations which compose this council was held in Chicago, January 27–29. The body meets in three sections, editorial, publication, educational. The most important matter at this meeting was the report of the Committee on Lesson Courses, which had been at work during the year. It appears that the new graded lessons, which most of the denominational publishing houses have given large attention, are presenting great difficulties to the small schools. It was reported from Canada that two-thirds of the schools have a membership not exceeding seventy-five, and that a curriculum involving eighteen simultaneous courses was altogether too elaborate. The question therefore arises whether there could not be a grading by departments instead of by classes, thus reducing the courses to five. If this were adopted it was the opinion of the committee that a new graded course would have to be prepared. This would not supersede the International curriculum but would be an alternative. No definite decision was reached but a meeting was arranged with the Executive Committee of the International Sunday-School Association for April. It is evident that there is still much adjustment to be made in religious educational curriculum.

Death of Professor Charles R. Brown

Professor Charles Rufus Brown was born in East Kingston, New Hampshire, February 22, 1849. He was graduated at the United States Naval Academy in 1869 and served in the United States navy from 1870 to 1875. He was graduated from Harvard University in 1877, and from the Newton Theological Institution in 1879. He studied at the University of Berlin in 1879 and 1880 and at the University of Leipzig in 1880 and 1881. He became associate professor of Old Testament interpretation in the Newton Theological Seminary in 1883, and becoming full professor in 1886 retained this chair until his death February 1, 1914.

Professor Brown was one of the first representatives of Old Testament scholarship

in the country to associate himself with Professor William R. Harper in the work of reviving and promoting the study of Hebrew in the United States. If we mistake not, the two scholars first became acquainted through a contribution which Dr. Brown sent to Dr. Harper to assist in the work of the Institute of Hebrew then recently established by Dr. Harper. The friendship thus begun continued to the end of Dr. Harper's life.

Professor Brown was pre-eminently a teacher. At the very beginning of his work as professor at Newton he published *Aramaic Method* and some ten years ago issued a *Commentary on the Book of Jeremiah with a New Translation*. He was profoundly interested in all the work of the institution of whose faculty he was a member, and in the progress of Christianity throughout the world. But he always gave his best strength to his classes and was rather indisposed to authorship and publication or to work of a more public character than teaching. In this work he rendered a great and valuable service to his generation, and his memory will be cherished both by the successive classes of students who for a period of more than thirty years came under his instruction, and by those of his fellows in the field of scholarship who enjoyed the rare privilege of his personal friendship.

The New Church Peace Union

On February 10 Mr. Andrew Carnegie established the Church Peace Union and endowed it with a fund of two million dollars. The affairs of the Union will be administered by a board of thirty persons representing the religious forces of the United States, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant. Mr. Carnegie's recognition of the new social power of the church is exceedingly gratifying, and is in large measure due to the success of the Federal Council. The secretary of the new Peace Union will be Dr. Frederic Lynch, secretary of the Commission of the Federal Council upon Peace and Arbitration. Professor Sidney L. Gulick of Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan, and stated lecturer to the Imperial University, is now lecturing under the auspices of the Federal Council on peace union in the interests of a better understanding between the two nations. It is expected that it will be possible to maintain similar lectures in various countries of the world. The Union is not limited by Mr. Carnegie to any single policy, but may undertake whatever course of action would serve to interest the religious forces of the world in international peace.

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH[1]

KEMPER FULLERTON, PH.D.
Professor of Old Testament Literature, Oberlin Theological Seminary

Everyone who takes up a commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah will wish to know what is done with the Ezra Memorabilia. Are they accepted as authentic and is Ezra to be placed before or after Nehemiah? The question of the authenticity of the Ezra Memorabilia has been rendered acute principally through the work of Professor Torrey of Yale in his *Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah* (1896) and especially in his *Ezra Studies* (1910). The latter is undoubtedly one of the most brilliant and original works upon this period in existence. In these books Professor Torrey resolves the Ezra Memorabilia into the "Chronicler's Masterpiece" and holds that it is a pure romance without any historical truth back of it. Professor Torrey has thus far not been able to carry the majority of scholars with him in this particular part of his construction, nor has he convinced Professor Batten. Our latest commentator accepts the substantial genuineness of the Memorabilia though he admits considerable editing by the Chronicler, and rejects Neh., chaps. 9 and 10, from the Memorabilia.

The present reviewer confesses that his sympathies are still with the position advocated by Professor Batten and feels that the criticisms of Professor Torrey's views (pp. 16–18, 46, 51) are for the most part pertinent. The attempt to answer Professor Torrey's argument drawn from the silence of Ben Sira (p. 51) is, however, ineffective.

If the genuineness of the Memorabilia is accepted, then the question arises whether Ezra precedes Nehemiah, as the Chronicler obviously holds, or follows him. Since Kosters' brilliant discussion of this question and decision in favor of the priority of Nehemiah's return, the current of criticism has set very decidedly in favor of this view. Here Professor Batten runs with the tide, and indeed it seems almost irresistible. But I would abstain from supporting this view by an appeal to Neh. 12:26 (p. 29); this is to push the letter of the passage beyond what is warrantable. Batten follows Bertholet in disconnecting Neh., chap. 10, from Neh., chaps. 8 and 9, and in associating it with Neh., chap. 13; but, unlike Bertholet, he denies that Neh., chap. 10, was once a part of the Memorabilia of Nehemiah. Accordingly Neh., chap. 10, has nothing to do with the so-called canonization of the Law. Professor Batten does not point out as distinctly as he should the very important bearing this has upon the orthodox critical theory of the significance of Neh., chaps. 8–10, which sees in these chapters the introduction either of the whole Law or at least of P in the form of a canon. Bertholet argued that chap. 10, which, according to him, refers only to the special matters mentioned in chap. 13, had taken the place of a section in which the congregation had adopted the *whole* Law and which once stood after chap. 9. This is a very unlikely supposition. Is it probable that a promise to assume certain incidental obligations would have taken the place of the canonization of the Law as a whole? When once chap. 10 is dislodged from its present connection and combined with chap. 13, a critical movement has begun which will

[1] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah.* By Loring W. Batten, New York: Scribner, 1913. Pp. xv+384. $3.00 net.

inevitably qualify very vitally the interpretation of Neh., chaps. 8–10, as a canonization of the Law. Hints in the same direction are found in Professor Batten's elimination of Ezra 7:21–24 (p. 308) with the conclusion that Ezra's connection with the Law is only "slight and incidental." But the bearing of all this on the interpretation of Neh., chaps. 8–10, as the introduction of the Priest's Code is not brought out as clearly as should be done. (Contrast the bold positions of Professor Torrey, based, to be sure, on different premises, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 196 and 262, note 14, in which not only the current critical interpretation of Neh., chaps. 8–10, is denied, but even the existence of a Priest's Code as such is called in question.)

But the reader will probably turn with even greater curiosity to the solution of the problems connected with Ezra, chaps. 1–6, than to the solution of the Ezra-Memorabilia problems. Are the Aramaic documents in Ezra, chaps. 4–6, accepted? Is a return under Cyrus accepted? What is done with Ezra, chap. 2? It is in this part of his commentary that Professor Batten's results show, as he tells us (p. 32), the greatest divergence from the conclusions of other students.

There has been an increasing tendency in recent years to attempt to solve the intricate problems of the first chapters of Ezra by means of Esdras (compare especially the work of Sir Henry Howorth and Professor Torrey again). Professor Batten takes advantage of this, with the result that he brings down the section Ezra 3:1—4:3 (4:4–6, be it observed, is separated from vss. 1–3) to the time of Darius and connects it with the arrival of Zerubbabel from Babylon in 520. Thus Ezra 3:1—4:3, a Hebrew document, becomes a duplicate of Ezra, chaps. 5 and 6, an Aramaic document. By an emendation at 3:3, according to which the surrounding peoples are represented as being in friendly relations with the Jews at the time of the erection of the altar, and by the separation of 4:4–6 from the preceding verses, Professor Batten is able to eliminate all opposition to the temple building in the time of Darius. There was no interruption in it after it once commenced. But in the Aramaic narrative, chaps. 5 and 6, a different course of events is implied. Therefore a choice must be made between chap. 3 and chaps. 5 and 6. Professor Batten prefers the emended chap. 3 (p. 20). To the present writer this seems to be very distinctly a mistake in method, a mistake which reaches its climax when a return of Sheshbazzar is accepted in the time of Cyrus on the basis of the Hebrew document in chap. 1, while the Aramaic statement at 5:16 is rejected as worthless!

If the arguments which Professor Batten employs (pp. 38–40) to defend his theories of chap. 3 are examined, they are found to be open to grave suspicion. If I understand him, they are three in number: (1) Josephus, *Antiq.*, XI, iv, 1 and 3; (2) Esdras, chaps. 4 and 5; and (3) the emended text of Ezra 3:3. But when Professor Batten relies upon Josephus he is relying upon a broken reed. The passages cited from that writer are classic examples of harmonizing glosses of which there are many more in their immediate vicinity. Hence they cannot be used as historical evidence. Esdras, chaps. 4 and 5, undoubtedly furnishes a very interesting problem but 5:71 ff. presents a serious obstacle to the use of Esdras as evidence for the return of Zerubbabel in 520 if Esdras, chap. 5, is allowed to stand as it is. Batten's remarks on these verses (pp. 9, 116) carry no conviction. Finally the proposed emendation of Ezra 3:3, which is really a cornerstone of Batten's general historical construction of this period, is most dubious. It is based on what Batten himself admits to be, in its present form, an impossible read-

ing of LXX B. Of course this in itself is no sufficient objection, for impossible readings often hide textual truths of great value. But I cannot feel that Professor Batten has elicited a permissible emendation from this reading, for it is based on the supposition that *κατωρδώδησαν ἐπί* can mean "favorably disposed toward" the altar. This view is in turn based on the use of the verb as the equivalent of ישר at Mic. 7:2; Ps. 119:128; Prov. 2:7, 9, 11. In none of these passages is the meaning "favorably disposed toward" permissible. The nearest seeming approach toward this meaning is at Ps. 119:128, but even there it cannot be allowed. Further, ישר itself nowhere in the Old Testament has such a meaning, not even at II Kings 10:15, the only passage where the word occurs which might conceivably be brought into comparison.

I will not deny that certain parts of chap. 3 may really describe events in 520, but I question the arguments by which Professor Batten seeks to support his view of this very important chapter.

It is singular that Professor Batten apparently has not availed himself of the exceedingly instructive monograph of Rothstein, *Juden und Samaritaner* (1908), in his interpretation of this chapter. At certain points he would find his views corroborated, e.g., in the emendation of "second year" to "sixth year" at 3:8, though Rothstein's historical deductions from chaps. 3 and 4 are very different from Batten's.

With regard to chap. 2, Professor Batten holds that "it may be an authentic census of Israel in the latter part of the Persian period" (p. 73). It perhaps ought to be said that the treatment of the lists in Ezra and Nehemiah is not the most successful part of Professor Batten's work. The deeper problems of these lists are scarcely touched.

The commentary is written in a more sprightly and engaging style than many of the commentaries in the same series.

BOOK NOTICES

Germany and Its Evolution in Modern Times. By Henri Lichtenberger. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1913. Pp. xxv+440. $2.50.

Religious, moral, and spiritual interests are in the foreground of this excellent study. The book traces the transformation of modern Germany from a feudalistic into a capitalistic society, following out the development along the lines of economics, politics, religion, philosophy, and art. The material facts constitute the background against which the author paints a vivid picture of modern spiritual Germany. Although the book treats of many things beside religion, its general atmosphere will be very attractive to students of religion. The author holds that while scientific reason and organization have displayed the most extraordinary powers among this people, the religious spirit has not undergone any diminution among them. Modern Germany does not, as a rule, maintain the necessity of antagonism between religion and science, but, on the contrary, endeavors passionately to reconcile them.

From the moment that the French Revolution spread its terror throughout Europe, the reaction against it turned logically to the advantage of the opposite principle—the papacy; and this to the detriment of "reformed" Catholicism and of Protestantism, both of which were hated by the ultra-conservatives. Conversions from Protestantism to Catholicism became frequent. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the Prussian kingdom was forced to capitulate to the demands of the pope.

To offset the resurgence of Romanism, the new German empire was brought into being; and this political structure is dominated by Protestant influence. The *Kulturkampf* was the struggle between the papacy and the empire, in which the secular power held its own and stemmed the tide flowing toward Rome. But

the ancient church is even yet very strong in Germany, and through the parliamentary "Center" has a formative influence upon governmental policy. Within the structure of the empire, however, the reaction against clericalism continues along new lines. The Lutheran state church is a body without a soul; and the working classes, permeated by Socialism, tend more and more to be either indifferent or actively hostile to Lutheranism and Catholicism alike.

Although religion is now going through a new crisis, Germany as a whole seems little inclined to cast Christianity aside. She seeks to adjust and accommodate, rather than to destroy. While the idealism of Schleiermacher and his spiritual successors has little influence, as yet, over the masses, it is an exceedingly vital factor in German Protestantism, and is the lever which tends to make it a "progressive" religion. This idealism is in high favor today, and is a characteristic manifestation of the national genius.

The Quakers in the American Colonies. By Rufus M. Jones, Isaac Sharpless, and Amelia M. Gummere. London: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xxxii+603. $3.50.

A scholarly work which ought to be widely placed in private and public libraries, valuable to students of both general and church history presenting material difficult to obtain elsewhere. As Professor Jones says, the story of the Quaker invasion of the American colonies has been often told in fragmentary fashion; but no adequate study of the entire Quaker movement in colonial times has yet been made from original sources, free from partisan or sectarian prejudice and in historical perspective. This the authors endeavor to do, with a generous measure of success. The book falls into five parts dealing with the Quakers in New England, the southern colonies, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

The book shows that the Quaker leaders clearly expected to make their type of religion prevail in America. They thought the Society of Friends was but the beginning of a world-religion of the Spirit. The extent of their influence in the life of the colonies has not been generally realized. Their new-born enthusiasm can be compared to that of the socialists in our own day. They believed that they had discovered a new principle which was to revolutionize all aspects of society. To the Quaker, God's revelation was confined to no "dispensation." The channel between the human and the divine was still open; and it had never been closed. To the Puritan, on the other hand, revelation was confined to the biblical dispensation, and came to an end with the production of the New Testament. Collision between these two conceptions and their advocates was therefore inevitable and sharp. So long as the collisions lasted, the Quakers flourished and seemed sure of a significant future in the unfolding life of America. As soon as they were free and unopposed, there came a slowing down and a loss of dynamic impact. The volume before us goes back to the origins of American Quakerism, and shows the blending of this beneficent stream of influence with the broader tide of life in the New World.

Religion and Religions: A Study of the Science of Religion, Pure and Applied. The Fernley Lecture. By James Hope Moulton. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1913. Pp. xx+212. $1.25.

This volume constitutes the Fernley Lecture for 1913. It is confessedly written as a sort of avocation while Professor Moulton was producing his Hibbert lectures of the same year. The volume shows something of the discursiveness of half extemporaneous writing, but it is none the less marked by solid scholarship and sanity. The opening chapter is a discussion of the historicity of Jesus, and may seem a trifle remote from a missionary lecture—a fact to which Professor Moulton refers. But the fact that such theories should be considered in this connection is an indication that our conception of the missionary task is expanding. The issue which is raised by the contact of Christianity with other religions is more clearly seen to be nothing novel, but is a recurrence of something which has happened repeatedly in the history of our faith.

Professor Moulton's treatment of the missionary problem, as such, is based upon his knowledge of the dealings of Christianity with the ancient religions and is always illuminating as a commentary upon what might be called the philosophy of missions. As we should expect the book is marked by breadth of view and sanity of judgment.

Mr. Samuel E. Stokes, who has given his life to the evangelization of India, publishes a little book on the historical evidences of Christianity, *The Gospel according to the Jews and Pagans* (Longmans, Green & Co., 50 cents). The work is edited by Dr. Murray, the Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge. It is meant primarily to help educated Hindus to feel that the life of Christ and the facts of early Christian history are susceptible of verification by the same kind of evidence which accredits the generally accepted facts of history. Thus the author seeks to demonstrate early Christianity, not from the Bible, but from non-Christian sources; and hence the title which he has chosen for his book.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. VII

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

This course is published in ten leaflets issued on the fifteenth of each month from September, 1913, to June, 1914. It is sent free to all members of the AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE *enrolling for this course. Membership in the* INSTITUTE *may be secured by sending the annual membership fee of fifty cents and four cents for postage to the headquarters of the* INSTITUTE, *at the University of Chicago.*

STUDY VI

CHAPTER XI

A LATER AND MORE COMPLETE HISTORY OF JESUS AS POPULAR TEACHER AND UNIVERSAL SAVIOR. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE

First day.—§ 63. *The author of the Third Gospel:* Philem., vs. 24; Col. 4:14 (cf. vs. 11); II Tim. 4:11; Luke 1:1–4. There are good reasons for believing that Luke, the physician and co-worker of Paul, was the author both of the gospel which bears his name and of the Book of Acts. The following evidence points to his authorship of the Third Gospel: (*a*) He is acquainted with Palestinian geography and with Jewish history, parties, customs, and thought as reflected in the gospel itself. (*b*) He is a zealous, liberal-minded Christian with Pauline tendencies. (*c*) Early church tradition mentions him frequently as the writer. (*d*) The use of many technical medical terms shows his medical training. Read the foregoing passages from Paul's letters.

Second day.—§ 64. *The preface to the Third Gospel; Luke's reasons for writing:* Luke 1:1–4. Read Luke's own statement concerning the literary and historical situation out of which this book arose (1:1–4). Give unusually careful thought to the various points here stated: (*a*) Many other narratives of Jesus' life were already in existence. (*b*) These narratives were based upon the direct statements of Jesus' personal companions. (*c*) None of these accounts fully meets the need of Luke's day, in his opinion. (*d*) Luke himself had not known Jesus, but had taken the testimony of those who had been with Jesus. (*e*) He had, however, carefully investigated the sources of his information before accepting them as reliable. (*f*) He wrote to help furnish Christians a more accurate knowledge of their Lord's life. Hitherto they had received oral training, or had gained their information from what Luke regarded as inadequate accounts of the Christ's deeds and words. Observe, in the following analysis, with what care our author has tried to locate Jesus' actions and teachings; and how, although he uses Mark

as one of his most reliable sources, he yet changes it frequently in the conviction that he is now producing the most complete and accurate gospel in existence.

ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

I. Preface (1:1–4).
II. Birth, childhood, and youth of John the Baptist and of Jesus (1:5—2:52).
  1. The birth of John the Baptist promised (1:5–25).
  2. Annunciation of the birth of Jesus (1:26–38).
  3. Mary's visit to Elizabeth (1:39–56).
  4. Birth and youth of John (1:57–80).
  5. The birth of Jesus (2:1–7).
  6. The angels and the shepherds (2:8–20).
  7. The circumcision of Jesus (2:21).
  8. The presentation in the temple (2:22–39).
  9. Childhood and youth of Jesus in Nazareth (2:40–52).
III. Preparation for Christ's public work (3:1—4:13).
  1. The early ministry of John the Baptist (3:1–20).
  2. The baptism of Jesus (3:21, 22).
  3. Genealogy of Jesus (3:23–38).
  4. The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness (4:1–13).
IV. The Galilean ministry (4:14—9:50).
  1. Early events at Nazareth and Capernaum (4:14–44).
    a) Beginning of the ministry in Galilee (4:14, 15).
    b) The rejection at Nazareth (4:16–30).
    c) A Sabbath at Capernaum (4:31–41).
    d) Leaves Capernaum, and preaches in Galilee (4:42–44).
  2. From the call of the Four to the choosing of the Twelve (5:1—6:11).
    a) Call of the Four (5:1–11).
    b) A leper healed (5:12–16).
    c) A paralytic healed (5:17–26).
    d) The call of Levi and the feast in his house (5:27–32).
    e) Question about fasting (5:33–39).
    f) Plucking grain on the Sabbath (6:1–5).
    g) A withered hand healed on the Sabbath (6:6–11).
  3. From the choosing of the Twelve to the sending of them out (6:12—8:56).
    a) Choosing of the Twelve (6:12–16).
    b) Sermon on the Mount (6:17–49).
    c) The centurion's servant healed (7:1–10).
    d) Widow's son at Nain (7:11–17).
    e) Message from John the Baptist (7:18–35).
    f) Jesus anointed in the house of Simon the Pharisee (7:36–50).
    g) Tour in Galilee continued (8:1–3).
    h) Teaching in parables (8:4–18).
    i) Natural and spiritual kinsmen (8:19–21).
    j) Stilling of the tempest (8:22–25).
    k) The Gerasene demoniac (8:26–39).
    l) The daughter of Jairus raised to life (8:40–56).

4. From the sending out of the Twelve to the departure from Galilee (9:1–50).
   a) Sending out of the Twelve (9:1–9).
   b) Feeding of the five thousand (9:10–17).
   c) Peter's confession and Christ's prediction of his death and resurrection (9:18–27).
   d) The transfiguration (9:28–36).
   e) The demoniac boy (9:37–42).
   f) Jesus again predicts his death and resurrection (9:43–45).
   g) The ambition and jealousy of the disciples reproved (9:46–50).

V. The journey to Jerusalem through Samaria (and Perea) (9:51—19:28).
   1. The final departure from Galilee (9:51–56).
   2. Answers to three disciples (9:57–62).
   3. Mission of the Seventy (10:1–24).
   4. Parable of the Good Samaritan (10:25–37).
   5. In the house of Martha and Mary (10:38–42).
   6. Teaching about prayer (11:1–13).
   7. Casting out demons (11:14–28).
   8. The sign of Jonah; the lamp of the body (11:29–36).
   9. Woes against the Pharisees uttered at a Pharisee's table (11:37–54).
   10. Warnings against hypocrisy and covetousness; injunctions to be watchful (chap. 12).
   11. The Galileans slain by Pilate: repentance enjoined (13:1–9).
   12. The woman healed on a Sabbath (13:10–21).
   13. Are there few that be saved? (13:22–30).
   14. Reply to the warning against Herod (13:31–35).
   15. Teachings at a Pharisee's table (14:1–24).
   16. On counting the cost (14:25–35).
   17. Three parables of grace (chap. 15).
   18. Two parables of warning (chap. 16).
   19. Concerning offenses, forgiveness, and faith (17:1–10).
   20. The ten lepers (17:11–19).
   21. The coming of the kingdom (17:20–37).
   22. The unjust judge (18:1–8).
   23. The Pharisee and the publican (18:9–14).
   24. Christ blessing little children (18:15–17).
   25. The rich young ruler (18:18–30).
   26. Jesus predicts his crucifixion (18:31–34).
   27. The blind man near Jericho (18:35–43).
   28. Visit to Zaccheus (19:1–10).
   29. The parable of the Minae (19:11–28).

VI. Passion week (19:29—23:56).
   1. The triumphal entry (19:29–44).
   2. The cleansing of the temple (19:45, 46).
   3. Conflict with the Jewish leaders (19:47—20:47).
   4. Commendation of the widow's gift (21:1–4).
   5. Discourse concerning the destruction of Jerusalem (21:5–38).
   6. The plot of the Jews and the treachery of Judas (22:1–6).

7. The Last Supper (22:7–23).
8. Discourse to the disciples (22:24–38).
9. The agony in Gethsemane (22:39–46).
10. The arrest (22:47–54).
11. Peter's denials (22:55–62).
12. The trial—Jesus before the Jewish authorities (22:63–71).
13. The trial before Pilate (23:1–25).
14. The crucifixion and death (23:26–49).
15. The burial (23:50–56).

VII. From the resurrection to the ascension (chap. 24).
1. The empty tomb (24:1–12).
2. The appearance to the Two on the road to Emmaus (24:13–35).
3. The appearance to the Eleven at Jerusalem (24:36–49).
4. The ascension (24:50–53).

Third day.—§ 65. *The birth, childhood, and youth of John the Baptist and o Jesus:* Luke 1:5—2:52. Luke has here made use of a special source, found in none of the other gospels; and judging from the many peculiar Hebrew phrases, so unlike Luke's usually smooth Greek, he has obtained it largely by translation from some Jewish-Christian (Aramaic) narrative. Notice with what tenderness and reserve our physician-author touches upon these most sacred experiences in the lives of two noble women, especially the happy meeting of Mary and Elizabeth and their long visit in the humble Judean home (read vss. 5–25, 26–38, and 39–56). Cf. Mary's psalm (vss. 46–55) with that of Hannah (I Sam. 2:1–10), composed under very similar circumstances. Note again with what pride Luke records the marvels connected with the birth of the great prophet John, 1:52–80.

Fourth day.—Read Luke's beautiful story of the entrance of the Christ into the world (2:1–39) and the one record that we have of his boyhood (2:40–52). What are the chief interests of Jesus and his most prominent characteristics as revealed in this story of his boyhood? Does Luke feel that all of the foreshadowings of these early days have been richly fulfilled in the public life of the Christ as it is known to him when he writes his gospel?

Fifth day.—§ 66. *Preparation for Christ's public work:* Luke 3:1—4:13. Refer to the analysis and read section by section. Notice that Luke finds himself able from other sources to expand Mark's meager story. How carefully he tries to locate the date of Jesus' work (vss. 1, 2*a*). What do vss. 5 and 6 suggest if Luke is writing for Gentiles primarily? In vss. 7–9 and 17 he has almost word for word the same account of John's preaching as we found in Matthew, showing the use of their common written source. Note, however, some new material which Luke adds in vss. 10–14, 15, 18. How does this strengthen your impression of John? How suddenly and briefly John's career ends in this gospel (vss. 19, 20)! Even in the baptismal account which follows John is quite forgotten (vss. 21, 22)! Has "the Mightier One" come, for Luke—the One who henceforth absorbs all attention?

Somewhere our author has found a special genealogy of Jesus, corresponding with that in Matthew only in a few names (vss. 23–38). Why does he trace Jesus' ancestral line back to Adam instead of simply from Abraham down (cf. Matt. 1:2)? Is it because he thought of Jesus in his relation to the whole race rather

than to the Jewish nation? Notice that he uses substantially the same account of the temptation of Jesus which Matthew employs.

Sixth day.—§ 67. *Early events of Jesus' ministry at Nazareth and Capernaum:* Luke 4:14–44. Opening his account of Jesus' Galilean ministry with words largely derived from Mark, but with added emphasis on Jesus' possession of the power of the Spirit, Luke passes at once to the rejection of Jesus by his own fellow-citizens (4:16–30), using here a fuller and richer narrative than that which Mark employs (cf. Mark 6:1–6 which occurs at a later point in the narrative). What characteristics of Jesus appear in this story of his rejection? Read also vss. 31–44, which are largely derived from Mark.

Seventh day.—§ 68. *From the call of the Four to the choosing of the Twelve:* Luke 5:1—6:11. Having found a more striking account of Jesus' call of the first four disciples than Mark has given (see Mark 1:16–20), Luke here substitutes it (read 5:1–11), as he had previously done in the case of the rejection at Nazareth. Read 5:12—6:11, an interesting revision of Mark's narratives, noting especially the following additions: (*a*) Luke 5:17*b*, how carefully the Jewish religious leaders are said to have watched Jesus; but how gloriously he revealed his power before their very eyes; (*b*) 5:26, the awe in which Jesus was held; (*c*) 5:29, how gratefully Levi (Matthew?) responded to Jesus' proof of friendship and trust; (*d*) 5:39, an editorial comment, either showing a lack of comprehension of Jesus' saying about the new spirit and power of the gospel, or explaining why so many did not receive the new truth by reference to their stubborn preference for traditional views.

Eighth day.—§ 69. *From the choosing of the Twelve to the sending of them out:* Luke 6:12—8:56. Notice that while Luke 6:12–16 has a parallel in Mark 3:12–19 and Luke 8:4–56 a parallel in Mark 3:31—5:24, Luke has inserted between these (in place of Mark 3:20–30) his 6:17—8:3 drawn from some other source, very likely the same from which Luke had already drawn his account of the rejection at Nazareth and the call of the four disciples. Read with care 6:17–49—a notable collection of sayings of Jesus, which agrees in main substance and in order with the "Sermon on the Mount" as given in the First Gospel, chaps. 5–7, but is much shorter and as evidently intended for gentile readers as the other is for the Jew. How do the "woes" of vss. 24–26 emphasize the blessings of the previous verses? State the principles of Jesus as set forth in this discourse, in your own words.

Ninth day.—Read 7:1—8:3. How did Jesus impress men of power, even strangers (7:1–10)? To what trouble does he go in order to help those in sorrow (vss. 11–17)? Why do you think John asks the question recorded in vs. 19, and just what does Jesus mean by his quotations from Isaiah (vs. 27; cf. Isa. 29:18, 19 and 61:1)? Does he refer to the new era of blessing which appears to have set in? What strong points does Jesus find in John (vss. 24–28*a*), and what is his final estimate of him? Does vs. 29*b* seem to you consistent with what Jesus has just said? Are these words perhaps the attempt of an editor to express his sense of the superiority of the gospel to anything which John had had a chance to experience? What does Jesus think of people who can see no good in so great a character as John (vss. 29–35)? Notice how in vss. 36–50 the characteristic of the people described in vs. 34 is illustrated. What marks of greatness in Jesus' character here manifested should have won these Pharisees?

Tenth day.—Read 8:4–56. Notice that, as mentioned above, all of these sections appear in Mark's Gospel in nearly the same order (Mark 3:31—5:43). Luke, however, has much softened Mark's story regarding the suspicions of Jesus' mother and brothers as to his sanity, perhaps because Mary was held in high respect among Christians and these brothers were now eminent members of the Christian community; perhaps also because he thought it impossible that they should ever have been thus suspicious of Jesus.

Eleventh day.—§ 70. *From the sending out of the Twelve to the departure from Galilee:* Luke 9:1–50. Jesus now takes a new step in the spreading of the good news (9:1–6). But a new enemy also was roused (vss. 7–9). Was it by suspicion of Jesus' motives and was there danger that Jesus would suffer John's fate, or has Herod's conscience become tender since John's death? Vss. 10–17 repeat Mark's story of the feeding of the five thousand. Read vss. 18–50, recalling the suggestions of Study V, Eleventh day, and noticing Luke's additions: (*a*) Jesus was much in prayer in these days (vs. 18; cf. vs. 29); (*b*) the burden of the conversation on the mountain was Jesus' approaching death (vs. 31); (*c*) the rest of the Twelve were not told at this time of the transfiguration experience; (*d*) vs. 45 adds another explanation of the strange ignorance of the Twelve concerning Jesus' death; (*e*) Jesus is able to read his disciples' hearts (vs. 47).

Twelfth day.—§ 71. *With his face set toward Jerusalem Jesus continues his teaching and gracious works:* Luke 9:51—19:28. In these ten chapters Mark is apparently Luke's source in 18:15–43 only. In 9:51—18:14 and 19:1–28 he is using another book which Matthew must also have had (or perhaps two, of which Matthew had one) and for the preservation of which in this way we have great reason to be grateful. Notice that Luke seems to give the whole record the character of a solemn and deliberate journey to Jerusalem (see 9:51; 10:38; 13:22, 33; 17:11; 18:31, 35; 19:28), reminding us of Mark 10:32. Aside from this there seems to be no distinct plan or logical arrangement. Read 9:51–62 and notice what characteristics of Jesus appear in these two narratives.

Thirteenth day.—Read 10:1–24, considering what is the purpose of the sending out of the Seventy, as Luke looks at it, and in what aspect Jesus appears in this event and those that follow (vss. 17–24). Read also 10:25–37, a notable parable of Jesus, and 10:38–42, a memorable incident, and state in a few words the teaching of each.

Fourteenth day.—Following the analysis, read 11:1–28. Remembering that, in a talk about prayer, Jesus was probably drawing truths from the depths of his experience, state in your own words these principles which should govern a life of prayer (11:1–13). In vss. 14–28 notice with what solemn and prophetic dignity Jesus proclaims the sacredness of the divine power which he feels within him (vs. 20 especially), and the constant need of keeping the life pure in order to make room for God (vs. 28).

Fifteenth day.—Notice that from 11:29 to 13:9 there is a constant note of warning. Read 11:29–54, and notice of what danger or evil he warns his hearers in each successive paragraph. If these exist today, state them in modern terms.

Sixteenth day.—In all this rich collection of Jesus' teaching that Luke has preserved for us, chap. 12 is one of the richest and most applicable to men of today.

Read 12:1–53 and sum up both the dangers against which it warns and the virtues that it enjoins.

Seventeenth day.—Read 12:54—13:9, noticing again the strong note of warning. Think what it all means if 12:54–59 was directed against the blindness of the Jewish leaders to the danger of their nation, and if the Galileans whom Pilate slew were Zealots seeking the kingdom of God by the sword, and the unfruitful fig tree (13:6) was the nation of Israel. Has this any meaning for today?

Eighteenth day.—Read 13:10–35, noticing the helpfulness of Jesus to the afflicted, his sternness toward the falsely religious Pharisees, his steadfastness in the face of foreseen death, and his pity for the impenitent nation.

Nineteenth day.—Read 14:1–14, and notice what it teaches about (*a*) the use of the Sabbath and (*b*) behavior as a guest and (*c*) behavior as a host. Are there still wider implications? Read also 14:15–35, noticing what the passage teaches about the conditions of participation in the kingdom.

Twentieth day.—Read chap. 15—another wonderfully rich portion of Jesus' teaching preserved for us by Luke from this older book. Unlike some of the preceding chapters, it is all on one theme. What is this, and what does the chapter teach?

Twenty-first day.—Read chap. 16, also (except for vss. 16–18 whose presence here is difficult to explain) mainly on one theme. What is this? There is something very perplexing about vss. 1–9, but there is no doubt about the type of character described in vss. 10–13, or about the central teaching of vss. 19–31. Is this fitted for that time only, or is it also most needful in any prosperous luxury-loving age like the present?

Twenty-second day.—There is no common theme of chap. 17 as a whole, though certain ideas recur. See the analysis, and reading 17:1–19 paragraph by paragraph, state the teaching of each. What manifestations of faith are illustrated in the second and third sections?

Read also 17:20–37. Here we find an apparent unity of subject but not so clearly of thought. Cf. vss. 20, 21 with 26–30. Has Luke perhaps brought together here different teachings on the subject of the coming of the kingdom and of the Christ without knowing just how they were related in thought? Has there always been perplexity on the subject of the "Day of the Lord" from the prophets down to the present? What teaching here is plain to you and helpful? Fix that in mind.

Twenty-third day.—Read 18:1–8 and 9–14. What is the common theme of these two sections? Cf. vss. 1 and 10. What is the teaching of each? Read 18:15–43, section by section (see analysis), and notice that in this passage Luke is again following Mark (chap. 10), and that you have also read all this in Matthew (chaps. 19, 20).

Twenty-fourth day.—Read 19:1–28, two sections taken, not from Mark, but from Luke's special source. To what class of society does Zaccheus belong, and what characteristic of Jesus stands out in this story? Is vs. 8 a boast or a vow? Name the qualities which Jesus commends in men or demands of them in this section and in the parable of vss. 11–28.

Twenty-fifth day.—§ 72. *Events leading up to the trial and crucifixion of Jesus:* Luke 19:29—22:62. Throughout these chapters Luke follows Mark quite closely

but occasionally omitting a paragraph and frequently adding details derived from some other source, perhaps oral tradition. With the aid of the analysis read 19:29–48, noticing Jesus' implied claim of messiahship and of authority in the temple. Vss. 37 and 39–44 are peculiar to Luke; cf. 13:34, 35.

Twenty-sixth day.—Read chap. 20 (cf. analysis), noticing the constant note of conflict with the Jewish leaders. Luke follows Mark very closely; the few changes (see vs. 36) are editorial only. Read 21:1–4, also from Mark.

Twenty-seventh day.—Read 21:5–38. This reproduces Mark's chap. 13, but with addition and changes which make it refer very distinctly to the destruction of Jerusalem (see vss. 21*b*, 22, 24, 28, 34–36; cf. I Thess. 5:1–11).

Twenty-eighth day.—Read 22:1–62. The issue of the conflict is no longer in doubt. Events now lead rapidly on to the cross. Cf. the analysis and note that Luke, while in the main following Mark, makes several important additions. See (*a*) Jesus' strong desire to share one last Passover with his disciples (vss. 15–17); (*b*) his longing to be remembered (vss. 19*b*, 20*b*); cf. (*c*) the strife over who should be greatest (vss. 24, 27–30*a*); (*d*) his warning of the Twelve (vss. 35–38); (*e*) the intensity of his prayer in the garden (vss. 41, 43–45); (*f*) his prohibition of defense on the part of his followers (vss. 49, 51, 53*b*).

See also differences in 31:34 and in 56:62. All these add to the impressiveness and pathos of the narrative, and suggest Luke's use of an additional source, or much personal inquiry.

Twenty-ninth day.—§ 73. *The trial and crucifixion of Jesus:* Luke, chap. 23. Did Jesus have a fair trial? Luke suggests a threefold accusation against Jesus (23:2, 5). Was the Sanhedrin right in its claim? In what sense, if at all, could Jesus rightly claim to be "king" (vs. 3)? What attitude do Pilate (vss. 4–7, 13–16, 20, 22*b*, 23*b*, 24) and Herod Antipas (vss. 8–12) take with regard to Jesus; and what characteristics are portrayed in these sketches furnished by Luke? Note Luke's further expansion of Mark's outline statements, and try to imagine the questions he asked and the people he consulted in procuring this added information: (*a*) crowds of friends and enemies followed every movement of Jesus and the authorities (vs. 27; cf. vss. 1, 4); (*b*) Jesus' heroic plea to his friends (vss. 28–31); (*c*) Jesus' treatment at the hands of his captors (vss. 32, 33*b*, 35–37; cf. 39–42); (*d*) Jesus' three cries from the cross (vss. 34*a*, 43, 46); (*e*) signs accompanying his death (vss. 45*a*, 47); (*f*) a stranger's thoughtfulness (vss. 50, 51*a*, 53*b*) and preparations by the Galilean women (vss. 54–56).

Thirtieth day.—§ 74. *The resurrection narratives.* The additions of Luke to the narrative derived from Mark are here very notable. Besides the little touches in vss. 1*b*, 5*a*, 6*b*–8, we have several extended narratives, all different in substance, and most of them in location of the events from those of Matthew: (*a*) vss. 9–12, the report of the women to the eleven and Peter's visit to the tomb; (*b*) vss. 13–35, the walk to Emmaus; (*c*) vss. 36–49, the appearance in Jerusalem; (*d*) vss. 50–53, the ascension. Consider how much these narratives meant to Luke and to his readers; and what the faith in Jesus' resurrection meant to the whole early church.

Looking back over the whole gospel, what impression of Jesus does it give you? Was it worth while for Luke to have made the effort which he describes in 1:1–4? Is his gospel a valuable addition to the other two? Does it make them unnecessary? Wherein does it differ from Mark? From Matthew?

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME XLIII APRIL 1914 NUMBER 4

"OF ALL MEN THE MOST MISERABLE"

So Paul described Christians who had no risen Christ. To have believed and lost belief was worse than never to have believed at all. They had not only been disappointed—they had proclaimed a false religion.

And the sin of that false religion was optimism! Because of the gospel men had believed in something which had given them joy, and had brought joy to others; and that belief had been a deception.

Of course, Paul did not believe that the good news was false. He was sure he had not believed cunningly devised fables. Back of his enthusiasm there was the thrust of a great conviction.

The misery of which Paul speaks was not confined to the first century. There is many a preacher of the gospel whose confidence in his message has been honeycombed by unwarranted doubt.

Sometimes these doubts are the outgrowth of reaction from impossible beliefs. Any man acquainted with the hyperorthodox knows how many men drop from the ministry because they have claimed to believe more than they had any right to believe. Along with the gospel they have carried over the figures of speech, the very intellectual clothing, in which the gospel was expressed. And when they have come to see that such intellectual habiliment really does not belong to the heart of the gospel they have thought that the gospel itself was lost.

Overtrained in dogma, they are incapable of meeting the pressure of the religious need of a modern world.

There are other men who have lost their old-time convictions for quite other reasons. They think themselves liberal because they

believe less than they once believed. Overemphasizing investigation, they have come to question everything.

For a few months or years, it may be, they have enjoyed the enthusiasm of men liberated from unnecessary beliefs, only at last to find themselves dispossessed of their spiritual ambitions.

Thereupon their spiritual engine has "gone dead."

In caring for the headlight they have forgotten the fire-box.

Both of these classes of men are to be profoundly pitied, not alone because of their own spiritual bankruptcy, but because their bankruptcy was unnecessary. Our Christian religion with its faith in a God of Law who is also a God of Love; in a Jesus who is his historical revelation; in an immortality which he has brought to light; in the gospel of salvation which he preached and which he demonstrated is not something to be cast to one side with impunity. It is too vital for life not to avenge its disappearance.

Intellectual sophistication is no substitute for spiritual certainty. There is an everlasting Yea, but there is no everlasting Perhaps.

To preach the gospel of Jesus with enthusiasm does not require one to train oneself in credulity or to qualify one's intellectual honesty by obscurantism. Today, even more than in Paul's day, we know that the gospel of the resurrection has a place in the new world which science is revealing to us.

The preacher with no message beyond the call to investigation will be the shepherd of skeptics. A preacher of convictions, even though those convictions may be too large to be cast in terms of the past, too precious to be subjected to the discipline of authority, possesses a contagious faith which will make faith epidemic among those to whom he ministers.

The progress of the church is not marked by abandoned convictions, but by the growth of faith.

The only miserable preacher of the gospel is the man caught by an intellectual panic, as unnecessary as it is foolish.

"BITTERNESS"—A SERMON

"Let all bitterness be put away from ye, with all malice."—Eph. 4:31; Heb. 12:15; Jas. 3:14.

G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS, D.D.
Professor of Homiletics, Union Theological Seminary

A theology that cannot be preached is a piece of intellectual bric-à-brac. One of the most hopeful facts in the present situation of the church is that theology is making men more religious. It is for that reason that we plan to publish every now and then in the BIBLICAL WORLD *a sermon by one of the great preachers of our modern world. No man could more suitably inaugurate this new policy than Dr. Ross. We particularly commend this to every man who grows impatient over the failure of the world to accept some truth that has moved his own soul. It sometimes happens that a new truth becomes a source of heat rather than of light. To keep sweet and patient, to endure misinterpretation and misrepresentation are the elementary duties of every man who would help his world.*

It will not be pleasant work to preach this sermon: nor, I imagine, will it be pleasant to hear. For the word "bitterness" needs only to be spoken to involve most of us in a common condemnation: to recall us to the most dismaying weakness in our personal character; to smite us into a sudden shame. I am going to speak of that which many of us who have professed Christ's name know has spoiled our Christian testimony and effectiveness as *nothing* else has done: that which has been the occasion of our sharpest remorses, and our most desolating self-disgust.

My brethren, I should be an arrogant Pharisee if I excluded myself from this condemnation. I know the bitterness of bitterness; the sharp, grinding shame and chagrin when one has betrayed, by unkind interpretations of other people's conduct, the acid spirit of cynicism, and bartered one's Christian name and force for a moment's taste of the pungent liquor of denunciation. I speak out of a sore heart and—this is not a sermon for children—only men and women who have known this same soreness of heart will care about or so much as understand what I am saying.

For I want to speak of bitterness in *Christian* people's hearts. That in human hearts unmoved by religion and unvisited by the gentleness of Christ, a harsh mistrust of others and quick suspicion and sensitive self-love should rule is not to be greatly wondered at. We should look for it, and perhaps should not be greatly astonished were it avowed and gloried in. But the diabolic miracle is that it should be found in hearts whom Christ has touched, who have been moved by his beauty and his love, and made some honest, not to say fluent and exuberant, response to that love. That contact with Christ has not driven the pettiness of self-love out of us, has not shamed out of us the smallness, the alertness to catch the hurt of insult, the suspicion of a slight, the suggestion of

hostility; that Christ's magnanimity has not made impossible a contemptible ingenuity in misinterpretation and misconstruction of motive, and has not flooded the nature with its own sunny radiance, and made it move and have its being in love—*that* is the astonishment, the dismay, and the sorrow of many a man and woman trying to be good.

We *must* get rid of this thing, brethren, or our Christian force and influence will absolutely disappear. It is hardly too much to say that men believe in us as Christians *only so long as they believe that we are kind:* only so long as they do not know that we are bitter, and retaliative, and alert to take offense, and cruel in misjudgment. When the veil is lifted and they know the facts, they have finished with us, and our profession of religion is but the minister of bitterness in them. Kindness is a beautiful thing in *any* man: it is an imperative necessity in a Christian. A Christian cynic is a contradiction in terms. You know what I mean: if I add that of course a Christian man is to have his opinion of unworthy conduct like other people, and that he also has the right to entertain righteous indignation against evil—you know that in saying that I am but echoing words that rise within you as self-defense against the sword of self-accusation. For you and I in practice, brethren, know quite well the difference between indignation against evil and bitterness against persons we dislike.

I

First, let us try to measure the strength of this accursed thing. Surely we were once unstained and breathed the air of more generous interpretations than we do now! Why? Is it because we were ignorant of the world and in happy unconsciousness of the hypocrisies of men? Then if that is so, this thing which we have now to crush and kill has on its side the *gruesome facts of human depravity.* Let us calculate on that. If today I set myself to try to be generous in my assumptions regarding my fellows, let me expect tomorrow to receive a rude shock, and let me nerve myself to resist the temptation to be ashamed of my naïve confidence in humanity. Someone, some Christian possibly, will grossly disappoint me this week, and forthwith the bitterness within me will be on its self-defense and justifying itself within me. Let me, I say, calculate on that.

But again, why once so frankly charitable and now so snappishly cynical? Was it because I was *freer, and didn't care about others' conduct?* It is a ghastly thing to see a young cynic: to see a young face, that should have been unwrinkled by suspicion, furrowed like a dried fig by its own withering superiority. No: we weren't like that. We simply didn't care: we took people as we found them and did not concern ourselves with quarrelings. Then has bitterness some unholy alliance with the entanglements of association in which we tend with the passing years to become more and more imbedded? As we go on in life we certainly tend to settle down in groups, classes, sets, cliques, clubs, coteries. We find our level, as men say; we begin to move among our equals, who are part and parcel of our life. It would appear, then, that this is part of the strength of this business of bitterness; that it finds its material (more's the pity) among our equals, among the people who

ought to be our loved comrades, who should reflect us, who should help us, and whom we should help. It is just these people upon whom our venom is spent. It is the old Aristotelian principle: "Potter envies potter." We are not bitter against those high above us in station; we rather please ourselves in our compassion for the very poor: it is these others, our equals, our possible rivals, who misunderstand us, who hide their real selves from us, who do the things we do but do them with irritating differences in opinion and manner—it is against these we are envenomed. Well, so be it: we know at least where the battle has to be fought, where self-repression will have to be most sternly practiced.

Once more, why were we once so happily free from the acerbity that curses us now? Well, we hadn't arrived at the vivid self-consciousness of today. We hadn't estimated ourselves, nor much cared about self-inspection; rather, we laughed at that sort of thing as morbid. We were glad to be praised, though; and we reveled in the kind appreciation of our friends. And—yes, there did come a rude awakening; our ambition soared high and we fell; and someone cut home into our hearts with a startling version of what men really thought of us. There are some men whose words are like hot irons: "There is," says the Book of Proverbs, "there is that speaketh like the piercing of a sword." So it came to us; perhaps it was some unjust accusation or undeserved neglect, perhaps it was some rough awakening to unwelcome truth; but anyway, we were disillusioned, and we have been cynics since and worse. Well, then, again we have measured the strength of the thing we have to crush. It is allied to, it is rooted in, self-love; and its handmaid is pride, and we shall have to attack these things, too, if this bitterness is to come to an end.

But, again, hadn't we better health when we were younger? Isn't that the simple explanation of our sunnier view of men and things? Hasn't this unfortunate bitterness, irritable quickness to define what we dislike, hasn't all this, to be plain, a dyspeptic origin? Is it not largely a matter of overdriven energies and overstrung nerves? Well, it need not be denied; if we gain a momentary relief from the pressure of self-accusation by such thoughts, let us have the relief by all means: *but* what it means is this: this thing which we have to fight is in alliance with variations in our physical condition, and we have to count on that, to reckon with it in the fight, not to excuse ourselves from the fight on the ground of it.

The allies of this enemy are becoming formidable; yet still we have not told the tale of them. There is one specially we must not overlook. I spoke a moment ago of its alliance with *pride*. Yes: but when we look back on things, that pride has taken a specific form: it has been pride in the cleverness of our speech. We cannot remember perhaps when people praised our first precocious epigram, but we do know that somehow we came to have a taste for the intoxicating stimulant of the pleased admiration of our friends when we said smart, sharp things about our neighbors. The thumb-nail sketches were diverting and clever and, of course, caricatures; to have been truthful would have been dull.

And when we were really roused by genuine irritation this talent for delineation became invaluable, and we rejoiced in it. Is this what the apostle James refers to when he says, "If ye have bitter envyings and strife in your hearts, glory not and lie not against the truth"? That is precisely what we did: we gloried most for at least one vivid intoxicated moment when our epigrams on other people were farthest from the truth.

How contemptible it all is now, as we look back on it! Yes, but how often have we seen it to be contemptible; yet under the excitement, or for excitement's sake, have gone back to the old sin! Aye, even in solitude we have drunk this heating wine: we have gone over fancied insults, and carved out words to define the hidden motives of conduct we could not understand, we have summed up the characters of our associates, we have practiced denunciation and nursed the fire of resentment; and that is why today this habit of judging is so inveterate and the bias to uncharitable judgment is so heavy.

This is the worst of all the allies of bitterness: its alliance with the processes of thought and the charm and power of speech. Let us calculate on that; let us move cautiously against the enemy; his weapon, the cruelest of all, is the very speech that comes so suddenly to our tongue in the excitement of passion or of praise.

Such is our foe, twining itself round what should be the dearest and pleasantest of our associations, manipulating our most useful gifts and trading on our most pardonable weaknesses, mercilessly ready to condemn us by a slip in speech —such is this spirit of bitterness which is eating the heart out of our Christian influence and destroying our Christian character.

And what power bitterness has to infect a man's whole nature! Viscount Morley reminds us in his *Cromwell* that a man's opinions are linked together by many invisible strands. Bitterness takes advantage of that unity in our nature, and taking possession of only a segment of man's thought at first will spread itself over every opinion and sympathy he possesses. Especially is this the case when the first access of bitterness comes through a great disappointment with men.

I well remember when the blow came to me; when, the glow and glamor of my ordination past, I had settled down to acquiring some knowledge of my people, and had been stunned by the appalling realities regarding the men and women in the ranks of professing Christians in the village where my ministry lay. I cannot forget the desolating dreariness of my disillusionment; and how my bitter disgust found expression in acidulated speech, and in crude sarcasms which a maturer experience would fain have unspoken. "Is there not a cause?" I said to myself at the time; "do I not do well to be angry?" For my blood boiled at the systematic dishonor done to Christ, the desecration of his sacraments and the riot of inconsistency in the profession of his name. But the lurking enemy of bitterness recked nothing of the occasion he could use to issue forth, whether it were just or not; the point is the bitterness tended to invade segment after segment of my thought; it began in my hasty judgment of a few villagers. In a month or two I found it in my

theology and my interpretation of the Christian ethic, and its tendency was ever vigorously to spread farther afield.

And as it spreads from department to department of a man's interests (I dare say you have known extreme cases of sour-spirited men who can admire nothing, appreciate no one, and who grudge a tribute of praise to the most obviously beautiful things), so it spreads from member to member of any community. "Beware," said the apostle, "lest a root of bitterness springing up trouble you and *thereby many be defiled.*" What a true touch that is! Have we not seen this unholy infection at work: happy companionships turned into knots of malice, groups even of Christ's servants becoming nests and hotbeds of unholiest resentment, their mutual smiles veiling a deep mistrust, and confidence and freedom utterly destroyed by the sordid necessity of maintaining a perpetual watchfulness lest by a word the one should exasperate the explosive self-love of the other? Oh, have we not chafed against this thing and just then most earnestly cried out to be delivered when our own fall into bitterness had most its origin in disappointment with ourselves?

II

What is to be done? It is not an affair of manners, this. It is mockery to tell us that smallness of nature and ingenuity in misconstruing conduct and fertility in misunderstanding—that these things are simply the vulgarities of the plebeian and disappear on the advent of education and refinement. The simple fact is that they do not; that they flourish in the very centers of learning and organized religion, and perhaps are least offensive just in the rough-and-tumble life of a great city, where men have less leisure for refinement of criticism and more readily condone, if not forgive. No; nothing external will remedy this thing. The effort must be directed from within.

And surely the first thing to do is to be clear that effort is necessary and worth while. Necessary, else we should not have the strenuous and urgent exhortations on this matter in the New Testament: "*Pursue* peace with all men"; "looking out *diligently*"; "*straining* to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." That is the way the New Testament speaks of this matter. It is assumed that there is a difficult work to be done. And that effort is worth while is shown most clearly by the fact that the prevalence of this thing in Christian communities depends largely on the training of opinion regarding it. In some Christian communities its essential opposition to the spirit of Christ does not seem to have been realized; there it is rampant and flagrant; in others it is counted a shame and disgrace. Surely the producing of that feeling of shame—or as we should say the educating of public opinion—is the very motive of the third chapter of the Epistle of James, with the wistful simplicity revealing the saddened heart of the apostle: "My brethren, these things ought not so to be."

And, brethren, I don't know that anywhere in the church the education of the Christian sentiment on this matter has been adequate. For years Christian sentiment on the subject of our duty to the *poor*, to the *needy*, to the generally dependent and inferior has been urged and urged with great success: but, as

the late Canon Mozley pointed out, not nearly as much work has been done in the department of Christian ethics which concerns our relations with our *equals*. And as I have said, it is there that the crux of this problem of bitterness lies.

Well, but the question presses: In what direction are we to make our effort? We begin at the outmost edge of interior reforms, if I may so speak, when we speak of cultivating repression of *speech*. Yet we must do that and do it seriously, with some serious apprehension of the fruitfulness of speech in good or evil, and of its terrible reflex action on the mind of the speaker. If a man habitually utters low and unjust judgments of others, he will himself sink to the level of his judgments; and we may have seen collapses of this sort ourselves.

And specifically, we must declare war against the type of clever speech that hurts. "We may put down," Father Faber says, "clever speeches as the first and greatest difficulty in the way of kindness." Nothing will avail to cure us of a bitter spirit unless we be made ashamed of the cheap *banalité* of cutting speeches and of shabby misinterpretations clothed in funny words. The daintiness of the apothegm does not strip the act of its vulgarity. Assassination is the same brutal thing, whether the weapon be a bludgeon or a stiletto. We must learn that *it is mean to hurt*.

Have you ever heard Cardinal Newman's definition of a gentleman? "It is almost," he said, "a definition of a gentleman to say that he is one who never inflicts pain. . . . . He carefully avoids whatever may cause a jar or a jolt in the minds of those with whom he is cast—all clashing of opinion, or collision of feeling, all restraint, or suspicion or gloom or resentment; his great concern being to make everyone at his ease and at home. He has his eyes on all his company: he is tender toward the bashful, *gentle toward the distant*, and *merciful toward the absurd*. He guards against unseasonable allusions, or topics which may irritate. He has no ears for slander or gossip, is scrupulous in imputing motives to those who interfere with him, and interprets everything for the best." Would to God that this idea of gentlemanliness were incorporated into our Christian practice and ambitions.

But we must go deeper still. Release from bitterness is largely a matter of width of sympathetic outlook and of preoccupation in great causes. Paul's exhortations against bitterness are never far removed from his reminders to his people of the great sweep of the action of redemption, of the vast circumference of the kingdom of God. Bitterness and narrowness of view, or at least narrowness of interest, always go together. If the church were missionary (let it be said for the thousandth time), her intractable divisions at home would be manageable, aye, would disappear.

The world is waiting for the gospel of Christ, for the Book of God, for the knowledge of the way of life: Christendom and Christian churches are rent by internal strife and the most acrimonious antagonism. Is it possible to avoid connecting the two things causally? And as it is with the church that is jaded with her own exceeding dulness, so it is with idle and self-seeking Christian units. They must stir the dulness out of their

too leisurely lives by the excitement of strife and the pungent delights of unfavorable criticism and evil surmisings. I grant you that you will get bitterness out of overworked people, as you will out of the religious unemployed, because the overworking of some is the corollary of the idleness of the others. But what would heal the hurt of many a disordered life, aching with the distemper of its own suspiciousness, would simply be absorption in the work of Jesus Christ, response to the call of his needy ones, and devotion to his program of service for the world.

And lastly and chief of all, the effort to crush bitterness must be carried to the region of prayer, of faith, of religious communion if any progress is to be made. When I see a Christian man fall into bitterness, especially when I am myself that man, I know that it is due to a want of *freshness in devotion*, to falling behind in the exercise of personal religion. In Hebrews 12:15 this is the very expression used: "Lest any man fail of, i.e., fall behind, the grace of God." When does a man fall behind the grace of God? When he is living not on the devotion of today, but on the emotions of yesterday; not on today's spiritual sustenance but on the mildewed manna of yesterday. There is an air of out-of-dateness, a hint of atrophy or rusting of religious faculty, about the Christian whose affections are narrowing in, whose kindly charitableness is wrinkling up into mean suspicions, and who has come out of the sunshine of love into the chilling fogs of cynicism.

It comes to this, brethren: your spirit and mine cannot be kept sweet for a day, not for a day, without direct contact with the spirit of Jesus. Do not tell me that that renowned Christian of the lancet-tongue and brilliant sarcasms is living a life of prayer. It is impossible. He could not be laying himself open to Christ's rebuke, and yet persist in the diabolic spirit of the traducer and the slanderer.

> Within thy tabernacle, Lord
> Who shall abide with Thee?
> And in thy high and holy hill
> Who shall a dweller be?
> Who doth not slander with his tongue
> Nor to his friend doth hurt:
> Nor yet against his neighbor doth
> Take up an ill report.

Yes, the kindness that beams from our faces on our brethren is the best evidence that we have been on the mount with God.

> There is no place where earth's sorrows
> Are more felt than up in Heaven:
> There is no place where earth's failings
> Have such kindly judgment given.

And our judgment will take after the kindness of heaven's judgment, if we are often in humble self-prostration on the Mount of Communion, and suffer to blow about us the refreshing wind of the Spirit of God.

MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL

IV. FROM WHAT AND TO WHAT ARE WE SAVED?

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.
Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary
Author of "Christian Theology in Outline"

The subject which is next to engage our attention differs from those which we have been considering thus far in that it deals with a need of which everyone has direct and first-hand evidence. When we took up the Bible, we began by asking why we need a Bible, and it was necessary to do this, for there are people who do not seem to think we do. It is a fact—a lamentable fact—that for a great many people today the Bible is an all but unknown book. If they were in trouble, it would never occur to them to go to it for help. If they were in perplexity, it would never occur to them to go to it for guidance. They seldom read it. If you were to quote a familiar text they could not tell you from what book it came. It is more than likely that they would not even know that it came from the Bible at all. For all practical purposes the Bible has completely passed out of their lives.

It is so with the second great need of which we spoke—the need of God. Here, too, there are people who, so far as outward evidence is concerned, are unaware of their need. They are not conscious of God's presence in their lives. He is not a factor with which they feel they must reckon in the solution of their problems. They never pray. They do not go to church. They tell us that they believe in the religion of kindness and that Nature is a good enough church for them.

If, then, we wish to commend our religion to people of this kind we must begin by showing why it is important to read the Bible and to believe in God. We must show that these fixed points in our Christian faith and practice are not arbitrary, but have found their place necessarily in answer to deep-seated human needs, needs that require only to be pointed out to be recognized.

But in the case of our present subject, no such preliminary explanation is necessary, for everybody who is old enough to know anything knows what it means to need salvation. Salvation means deliverance, help. It is the promise of relief from the evil of which life is full, the assurance of well-being and safety. To ask from what and to what we are saved is to ask from what evil we need to be delivered and what consequences we may expect to follow from the deliverance. This is a question of universal human interest. If you do not believe it, read the advertisement columns in the daily papers, or better still, the magazines, with their long list of remedies for the countless ills to which flesh is heir. Listen to the conversation of any group of men and women who know one another well enough to talk of the subjects that interest them most, and you

will find that they are talking about the need of salvation—either their own or somebody else's. They do not call it by that name, to be sure, but that is what they mean. There is no one, I repeat, old enough to know anything, who has not faced the fact of evil in his own experience and learned what it means to need deliverance. In every age, religion has made its most direct and persuasive appeal through its promise of help to people who were in trouble—in other words, because it has offered men salvation.

I have a friend, a man of singularly fine and unselfish feeling, who tells me that he thinks this matter of preaching salvation has been greatly overdone. Religion, he declares, is constantly presented as if it were a sort of medicine, a patent remedy, warranted to heal sickness and to cure sin, or, if not that, as a kind of life insurance policy, guaranteeing the insurer against the danger of loss and safeguarding him against the effects of his own misconduct and folly and that of others. But such a conception of religion, my friend holds, is altogether unworthy of its dignity. Religion is not something for the sick merely, but the well; not for the weak, but for the strong; not for the sinful, but for the righteous. Religion is the way by which we enter into the highest life possible and develop our capacities to the utmost. Religion is something for men at the height of their power and in the zenith of their prosperity, not simply for the hour of failure or the day of death. Religion is joy rather than comfort; fulness of life rather than safety; service rather than salvation.

I have much sympathy with this point of view. In our desire to help men in their troubles, we often overlook the positive aspects of our religion. We greatly need the kind of preaching of which my friend speaks, preaching that will emphasize the virile and heroic aspects of Christianity; preaching that will present religion as a generous and satisfying life, the one adequate outlet for the energies that in most of us are but half used; preaching that will sound the note of adventure and enthusiasm, such as was struck by James Chalmers, Robert Louis Stevenson's friend, when he wrote:

> We want "men and women who think preaching and living the gospel to the heathen the grandest work on earth. . . . . We want men who will thoroughly enjoy all kinds of roughing it, who will be glad when ease and comfort can be had, but who will look upon all that comes as only the pepper and salt giving zest to work, and creating the appetite for more."[1]

But while this is true, and we cannot emphasize it too strongly, it is not all the truth. Whatever may be the case in the bright future to which we look forward by and by when the spirit of Christ shall be everywhere victorious and God's will be done on earth as it is done in heaven, certainly here and now men are the victims of sickness and sorrow and sin and death and failure in all its countless and heart-breaking forms. However much more there may be in religion than the word "salvation" expresses, it remains true that if we are to reach men at the point of their present need, here is where we must begin.

[1] *Autobiography*, p. 214.

But though we should all agree as to the need of salvation, we should find it less easy to agree as to the particular evil from which men most need to be saved. For there are so many kinds of evil. There are evils which attack us from without, and evils which have their seat within. There are evils which affect us as individuals, and there are social evils. There are ills of the body, and ills of the mind. There is ignorance; there is sorrow; there is sickness; there are failure and misfortune; and there is the great family of evils which have their source in a perverted will. Clearly, if we are to help people intelligently, we must decide which need is greatest and where salvation is to begin.

Here the preachers of a generation ago had a great advantage, for they knew just what they were trying to do. With most of the evils of which we have been speaking, they were not concerned—at least, not primarily. Their special ministry was to the soul of man. It was their aim to set men right with God. The salvation they preached was from sin and the punishment which was its inevitable consequence.

Study the career of any one of the older revivalists, and you cannot help being impressed with the businesslike way in which he set about his work. The first thing which he attempted to do when he came to a new place was to make his hearers realize their absolute helplessness apart from God. He began by preaching the law. He warned men of the inevitable consequences of their sin, and only when he saw that they had been brought to a proper sense of the seriousness of their condition was he ready to follow up the first impression with the message of forgiveness and peace.

And not only did the preacher know what he was trying to do, *but the people knew too.* We used to hear a great deal when I was a boy about the way of salvation. It was a way that had been trodden so many times that it was possible for anyone who wished to know just where he was going. People might not choose to go, but they knew where the way was, and they had no doubt that if they followed it, it would take them where they wanted to go.

If we look more closely at the salvation which the old revivalists preached, we find that it had two characteristics. In the first place, it was salvation from punishment; and in the second place, it was salvation from a punishment which was to be inflicted by and by.

This does not mean, of course, that deliverance from punishment was the whole of the preacher's message. He knew as well as we that the evil of evils was sin itself. Indeed the worst punishment which God could inflict upon a man was simply to let him continue in his sin. But to his thought punishment was something independent of sin and added to it, something from which a man needed to be delivered for its own sake, even after he had turned from his sin. It was not enough to repent in order to be forgiven, even if you were able to do so, which you were not. There was a necessity in the nature of God which required that past sin should be punished, and it was because it provided a way of escape from this punishment that the preaching of the atonement brought such relief to tortured spirits.

But it was not simply punishment

from which men needed to be delivered, but future punishment. The great day of reckoning to which the soul looked forward was not in this life but in the life to come. For a time, to be sure, the wicked might flourish like the green bay tree, but in the end his doom was sure. When death came he would be brought to the bar of divine judgment and face the great alternative of heaven or hell.

Here too we must be on our guard against exaggeration. Many descriptions of the older preaching of future punishment fail to do justice to its spiritual profundity. The older preachers realized as well as we that the true hell is not without, but within. It is separation from the comfortable presence of God here and hereafter. None the less it is true that in their thought of this separation they had the future rather than the present in mind. They were thinking not so much of present deliverance from sin as of escape from those torments of mind and body which awaited the impenitent after death. The message of the preacher was that of evangelist to Christian: "Flee from the wrath to come."

Here, then, we have a perfectly definite program. The minister of an earlier day, I repeat, knew just what he wanted to do. If you had asked him for his answer to our question today: From what and to what are we saved? his answer would have been instant and precise: We are saved from hell and to heaven.

There are many people today who no longer find this answer satisfying. A change has come over men's thought, but above all, over their feeling, of which the thoughtful preacher is obliged to take account.

This change is due to two causes. It is due partly to a change in the conception of punishment, and partly to a new sense of the importance of the present life.

I have already had occasion to refer in another connection to the change which has taken place in our conception of justice. We no longer think of it as something which exacts punishment for its own sake. We think of justice as a means of bringing about right relations between man and his fellow-man, and punishment as one among other instruments to be used for that purpose. According to this view punishment is not something from which we need to be saved. It is itself the means of our salvation. Instead of being the vindication of an abstract principle of right, it is a tool put into our hands for the discipline and reformation of the offender. We have found in our prisons and our reformatories that when we treat men fairly, kindly, and hopefully, they respond to our treatment, and we see no reason why, when we are persuaded that their lives have been changed, they should not again be restored to society. We do not believe that God is less good than man, and so it is natural for us to think of him, too, as making justice the instrument of his love.

But it is not simply that we have a different conception of punishment. Our whole perspective has altered. The other-worldly Christianity of another generation has yielded to a view of religion which is primarily concerned with the life that now is. We wish a salvation for today—a salvation which can

deal with the specific evils of whose presence we are most conscious here and now—political evils like injustice, economic evils like poverty, physical evils like disease. It is not enough to believe that individuals here and there may be delivered from their present sinful environment. We wish to be assured that the environment itself is to be transformed into one that will favor and not hinder freedom and progress.

Into the causes of this change I need not enter here. In part it is due to a clearer recognition of the unity of life. We have learned for one thing that there is no such thing as a purely isolated individual, that we are literally members one of another, so involved with the men and women by our side, in a hundred complex relationships, that it is absolutely impossible for us to separate our interests from theirs. We have learned, too, how intimately and in how many ways the spiritual graces we value most highly are rooted in the homely soil of economic opportunity. We see that drunkenness and immorality are not simply sins of individuals. They are symptoms of an unsound social order, and so we are shifting our point of attack. We are trying not to save individual drunkards and prostitutes but simply to create such social standards and habits as will make their existence forever impossible, and in our devotion to this immediate task we have lost sight for the moment of the more distant future for which the present is a preparation.

I am not concerned here with passing judgment upon the change, but simply with registering the fact. We may admit that there is a truth in the older view of punishment which many of us have too lightly dismissed. If punishment is really to reform, it must be recognized by the one who receives it as just. Take away its inevitableness and you impair its disciplinary value. The lawlessness which is so serious a menace to our social and political life is due in no small part to the fact that so many men have lost the sense of accountability to an authority which cannot be evaded.

We may admit, too, that any gospel of salvation which confines itself to the present merely, and does not take into account the longer future, is bound in the long run to prove unsatisfying. The richer and fuller we make life here, the more we put into it of spiritual meaning and value, the less we shall be content with the thought of its ultimate cessation. But however this may be, the fact remains that in both the respects to which I have referred, there has been a change of emphasis with which we must reckon. Even if we do not feel it ourselves, others do. There are many people for whom the old form of appeal has lost its force, and if our preaching of salvation is to be effective we must have some clear-cut message to take its place. What shall that message be?

This brings us to the first of our two questions: From what are we saved? The older answer was: "We are saved from punishment." In contrast to this, it would seem natural to say that we are saved from sin. If the older preaching was at fault in making too much of the consequences, let us go back to the cause. Sin at least is a present fact whose existence everyone recognizes, and no one will deny that we need to be saved from it.

But the trouble with this answer is that it is too vague. No doubt, everyone will admit that we need to be saved from sin in general, but our trouble begins when we try to deal with sins in detail. How can we tell whether any particular act is a sin? Is there any principle which will determine this for us?

This is a question which comes home with increasing force to every conscientious Christian. One of the most striking facts in the social life of today is the breaking-down of standards. The definite rules in which the older ethics formulated the ideal of human conduct can no longer count on an undivided public opinion. This is not necessarily due to any lack of moral sensitiveness. It is due in part to the growing complexity of modern life. New conditions are constantly arising which could not be foreseen; new factors entering the field which must be taken into account. I am not thinking simply of the changes which affect our individual standards, such as the new economic conditions which have modified our attitude toward Sunday observance, or the new attitude toward intellectual inquiry which has been the fruit of modern science. I am thinking of a whole group of sins which have grown out of the new social and economic environment, for which the older ethics made no explicit provision—the sins of the corporation, for example, sins for which we can hold no single individual exclusively responsible because we all alike share the responsibility. We need some principle at once definite and flexible which will unify our thinking and act as a positive guide in the new conditions which we face today.

Such a principle modern theology gives us in its teaching concerning the normative significance of Jesus Christ. Sin, it tells us, is any departure from the standard he has established, on the part either of the individual or of society. Sin is un-Christlikeness, and that is only another way of saying that it is selfishness. Sin is the preference from motives of self-indulgence of any other end for the supreme end which Christ has revealed, namely, the kingdom of God.

Such a definition helps us in two ways. In the first place, it gives us a general principle, simple enough to be easily intelligible, yet at the same time comprehensive enough to take in all forms of evil; and in the second place, it helps us to deal with specific evils by showing us wherein their real evil consists.

Take, for example, that old vice of intemperance which has been the text of so many a sermon. What is the real sin of drunkenness? There is a sin against the individual, no doubt, but there is a greater sin against society. The worst evil of the drink habit consists in the consequences which follow from it for others. It consists in the temptation which it puts in the way of those who have not the strength to resist. It consists in the decreased social efficiency of the men who have formed the habit, the fact that they are no longer so effective as workers, so responsible in positions of trust, so lovable and dependable as husbands and fathers; in the fact, in short, that they are no longer able worthily to fill their places in the great family of God.

It is so with all the other sins which are commonly catalogued as individual, such as gambling or impurity. The evil in each case includes not only the effect

produced upon the man himself, but the social consequences which follow from it. It is the fact that the self-indulgence which the habit fosters is bound to bear fruit in cruelty, misery, and degradation.

But our principle has a much wider application. It bears not only upon the individual sins which formed the staple of the older preaching, but upon those newer forms of social sin which have grown out of the changed conditions of our modern industrial life. It gives us a principle by which we can judge social practice everywhere. Does it advance or hinder the kingdom of God? Is it an expression of brotherhood, or its repudiation? Here is a wide field into which our present plan will not allow us to go in detail. It includes whatever affects the social welfare and efficiency of the people; the method of producing wealth and of distributing it; the conditions of housing and of education; the prevalence of social habits and standards—all, in short, that is either uplifting or debasing in a community.

Some years ago the country was stirred by the accounts of a lynching in a northern state, where a wounded negro under trial for his life was taken by force from his bed in a hospital by a mob of armed men, carried to a public place in the neighborhood, and burned to death in the presence of a crowd of more than four thousand people, none of whom made any protest or attempt at rescue. How shall we judge such an occurrence from the Christian standpoint? What is the sin which calls for national repentance? Not simply that the thing was done, but that conditions existed that made it possible. The sin was the sin not simply of the men who piled the fagots or set the torch, not simply of the men who looked on with approval or at least acquiescence, but of the whole community in which there had grown up a spirit of brutality and lawlessness making possible such an outbreak. It was the sin of the churches which had failed in their preaching of brotherhood; it was the sin of the schools which had failed in their teaching of responsibility; it was the sin of the government which had failed in its enforcement of order; it was the sin of all of us whose omissions and commissions go to make up that mysterious force which we call public opinion, and which here, as so often in the past, had proved itself impotent for good. *If we had been the men we ought to be*, the evil thing could never have happened. The salvation we need—the salvation which is to deliver us from our real sin—cannot stop with the surface evils which show themselves openly in the body politic, but must attack the un-Christlikeness which is their underlying cause.

We have answered the first half of our question: From what are we saved? We are to be saved from un-Christlikeness which is selfishness. But our task is incomplete until we have answered the second part as well. To what are we saved? Here again the answer is clear. We are to be saved to Christlikeness, which means saviorhood.

This idea of salvation to service is no new idea. You will find it splendidly expressed in Luther's great tract *On Christian Liberty*. "A Christian man," says Luther, "is the most free lord of all men and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all

and subject to every one."[1] He is free since Christ has saved him; he is servant since it is his part to be a Christ to others. Yet, closely as the two aspects of the Christian life are connected, they are yet independent. Service to Luther was something added to salvation, not a part of salvation itself. Salvation was complete when the saved man knew himself forgiven through Jesus Christ. Service was the life that followed as a consequence of this forgiveness. It was the way the Christian took of showing his thankfulness for having been saved.

To understand the significance of this distinction we must remember Luther's situation. He was facing a church that taught salvation by works, and he wished to make it perfectly clear that salvation was not something which a man could earn by his own merits, but must come to him as a free gift. Salvation was the renewal of fellowship with God which came with the consciousness of forgiveness. It was filial confidence, the upward look of the child to the father. Salvation, in a word, was sonship.

This is the meaning of that old doctrine of justification by faith, which has so often been misunderstood. Justification by faith is the theologian's way of saying what Jesus said when he talked about the childlike spirit, and it was to safeguard this great truth against the assaults of legalism in every form that the Reformers and their successors were so careful to distinguish between justification and sanctification; between salvation, which is forgiveness, and its consequence, which is service.

But we see today that the connection is even closer. Service is not something added to salvation as its consequence. It is a part of salvation itself. You cannot love the God whom Christ revealed without beginning to love your fellow-man. The same experience which reveals to you your sonship shows you your brotherhood too. The test of being saved oneself is that one begins to save others.

This insistence upon the indissoluble connection between salvation and service is the characteristic note of our modern Christianity. It is not simply that we have come to see that you cannot have a salvation for the individual alone, but that we should not be satisfied with it, even if we could get it. We feel so keenly our kinship with the men and women all about us who are struggling for a larger and a fuller life that we cannot be content with any solution of our own problem which does not bring deliverance to them.

But when we ask ourselves what we can do to help these brothers of ours we find less clearness. We are saved to be saviors. But what does it mean to be a savior? From what and to what are we who have been saved to save others? Clearly from the same evil from which we have been saved ourselves. We are to save men from un-Christlikeness, which is selfishness, to Christlikeness, which means saviorhood.

When we bring our modern Christianity to this test the result is less satisfactory. There is an immense amount of activity among Christians. From morning till night, and often far into the night, we are at work with our clubs and our societies and our committee meetings. There is no one of all the

[1] Wace's ed., 1883, p. 104.

long list of ills at which we glanced a moment ago which is not being somewhere and somehow attacked. But the results do not seem commensurate with the effort. The forces of the enemy multiply faster than we can shoot them down. The weeds grow faster than we can pull them up. And the reason is not far to seek. We are dealing with consequences rather than causes, with symptoms rather than with the disease. In our own way we are repeating the mistake of the older preachers who tried to save men from punishment rather than from sin. All these evils of which we have been speaking are the effects of one fundamental and deep-seated evil —the radical selfishness of the human heart. We shall never have men really saved till we have saved them from this. How are we to do it?

Well, how were we saved ourselves? What was it that delivered us from the bondage of our own self-love and introduced us to the life of service? This is a very searching question for it pierces to the very roots of our being and forces us to ask ourselves anew how far we are saved ourselves—saved, I mean, in the full Christian sense of that great word. It is a question which each must answer for himself, in the solitude of his own soul. But I am sure of one thing, that so far as we can truthfully answer it in the affirmative we shall confess that what saved us was someone's love. There is only one way to produce love, and that is by loving. "We love," says the apostle, "because he first loved us."[1]

This doctrine of salvation by love is the characteristic feature of the Christian religion. Ever since we were children we have been told that God is love. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."[2] We have heard the words so often that they have almost ceased to convey any meaning to us. To appreciate what such a phrase as salvation by love really means when applied to God we have to make a distinct effort of the imagination.

What does it mean to love in the sense in which Jesus used the term? It means to respect another's individuality. It means to make the interests of another your own interests, his fortune your fortune, his welfare your welfare. It means to desire earnestly his highest good. It means to carry him on your heart, hour by hour, day by day, year by year.

That was what gave Jesus his great power over men. He was the great lover. He was always thinking about other people's welfare. He went about doing good. He healed the sick, he fed the hungry, he comforted the sad, he forgave the sinful, he taught the ignorant. But these, after all, were only symptoms of something deeper. Jesus *cared* for men. He believed in their capacity for infinite development. He carried them on his heart, as the shepherd carries his sheep.

Now the Bible tells us that this is what God is always doing. He is doing a thousand things for us, supplying our physical needs through the bounties of Nature, ministering to our sense of beauty by sunrise and evening star, guiding our consciences by the warnings of his Spirit, rousing us to new activity

[1] I John 4:19.

[2] John 3:16.

by the call of duty or the spur of danger; in countless ways by his overshadowing providence making life the wonderful and fascinating thing it is, but above and beyond all this, he *cares* for us. He carries us on his heart, as the good father carries his children. He is the great Shepherd of our souls.

And that is what he wants us to do for one another. It is a good thing to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked and to visit the prisoner—nay, it is a necessary thing. Jesus has told us that they are his representatives and that when we minister to them we are ministering to him. But without love what is our ministering worth? "If I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing."[1] There is a worse evil than thirst from which men need deliverance—a worse evil than cold, a worse evil than imprisonment, a worse evil than nakedness, and that is selfishness, and the only thing that can save from this is love.

Near one of our great cities there is a reformatory for girls. It was the outgrowth of the efforts of a good woman who believed that the indiscriminate association of first offenders with hardened criminals was responsible for the destruction of many lives that might be saved to usefulness and self-respect. From the first the reformatory has been singularly fortunate in its management. It has been free from the curse of politics. It has secured the most highly trained women for its positions of responsibility, and its record of lives saved and characters transformed is a most encouraging witness to what can be accomplished by the resources of modern science and modern philanthropy.

To this reformatory there came one day a girl with whom the superintendent and teachers could do nothing. Handsome, strong, intelligent, she was utterly reckless and self-willed, and much of the time it was necessary to keep her under physical restraint to prevent her from doing injury to herself and others. Her story, as it was subsequently learned, was the familiar story of early mismanagement resulting in the exaggeration of the evils it was designed to cure. "Kate," her parents used to say, "if you do this I'll kill you." "But I very soon found," she said, "that they did not kill me, and I determined that the way to have my own way was to have it, and I did." Against this ingrained self-will all the resources of the institution were tried in vain. Kindness and sternness, gentleness and force were equally ineffective, and all who had to do with Kate were in despair.

One night a message came to the superintendent from the matron in charge of the cottage where Kate was living to come over at once, as the girl was rebellious and her outcries were keeping all the other inmates awake. When the superintendent came she found Kate confined in a cell in handcuffs, sitting on the floor, since she had torn everything else in the cell to pieces. Like a wild animal she tossed from side to side, screaming in such a way that rest was impossible for anyone within range of her voice. The superintendent entered the cell, sat down beside her on the floor and tried to coax or reason her into a better frame of mind. At last,

[1] I Cor. 13:3.

exhausted in body and worn out in spirit, she lost her self-control, and before she realized what she was doing, had burst into tears. Instantly Kate stopped screaming and for some time sat regarding her companion in silence. At last she spoke: "Miss Smith," she asked, "are you crying?" "Yes, Kate," the superintendent answered. "Why are you crying?" Kate continued. "I am crying because of you, to think that after all my effort I am unable to do anything for your good." Again there was silence. Then Kate said abruptly: "Miss Smith, that is the first time in my life that anyone ever shed a tear for me. This breaks my heart; I cannot stand it. You can take the handcuffs off. You won't have any more trouble with me."

The superintendent took her at her word. The handcuffs were removed and the miracle was wrought, not instantly or without many a struggle and some failures, yet certainly, the wild beast was tamed, the devil cast out, and Kate, once the despair of the institution, became the mainstay of superintendent and matron in dealing with the new cases that baffled them. "Leave her to me," she would say. "I know how she feels, I can deal with her," and she did. The saved had become a savior, and a savior she remains to this day.

It is the old story of redemptive love. You can hear its like in any rescue mission. But the interesting thing about the story and the reason I have told it here is that it did not happen at a rescue mission, but at a state reformatory which is the expression of the latest word in scientific charity. When everything had been tried that science could suggest, the old doctor Love was called in and wrought the cure.

This does not mean that modern methods are useless; that we have nothing to learn from the new philanthropy as to how to help men and women in their need. You will surely not so far misunderstand me. Love cannot work in a vacuum. Like every other workman it needs tools, and the better the tools the better it can work. The inspiring thing about the whole scientific movement is that it has so mightily enlarged our capacity for service by showing us how many more things we can do than we had supposed to help people in their need. But after all, all these things are tools. Mighty as the instruments of love, in and of themselves, they are impotent. It is as true today as when Christ lived and died, that the only sure way to save is to love.

Now love is the most costly thing in the world. It cost Christ Calvary, and every man who shares Christ's spirit and gives himself to his work will find that he too will have to pay the price. "If any man would come after me, said Jesus, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me."[1] It is a law of life that we can have only what we pay for, and the things that are most valuable cost most.

That is the meaning of the doctrine of the atonement—that great truth which lies at the heart of the Christian religion. It is the expression of the fact that the law of cost is valid for God as well as for man. God, too, can have only what he pays for; and for him, too, the things which he values most highly cost most. God could not save without loving, and

[1] Mark 9:34.

he could not love without suffering. Even before Christ came Isaiah had grasped this great secret when he wrote of God: "In all their affliction he was afflicted; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them and he bare them and carried them all the days of old."[1] God is the great sufferer because he is the great lover. Atonement is not something which happens outside of God to make forgiveness possible. *Atonement is something which happens in God.* It was what it cost God to bear the world's sin, your sin and mine.

Religion is fellowship with God, and fellowship means unity in thought, in purpose, and in feeling. To be a Christian means to make God's point of view one's own—to feel toward men as he feels toward them, to desire for them what he desires for them, to care for them so much that one is willing to suffer for them—nay, to love them so much that one cannot help suffering for them, when one sees them fail of their highest good.

This does not mean that we are to go through life heavy-hearted, as though the burden of the world's salvation rested upon our shoulders; as though God's redemption needed some supplement that our suffering must supply. It does not mean that we should always be looking on the dark side of life, that we are to be blind to the joy and beauty of which the world is full. It does not require us to shut our eyes to the fact that God's method is one of progress, and that the standards by which we judge the beginners in the moral life are very different from those which we apply to those who are further advanced. But it does mean that the standards which we apply must be those of Christ. It means that we shall grieve over the things that grieved him and rejoice over that which gave him joy. It means that that mind should be in us which was also in Christ Jesus, of whom we read that, "being in the form of God," he "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross."[2]

Have we the mind of Christ? Is our attitude toward life and its problems his attitude? Does he determine our estimate of values? Do we measure success by the standard by which he measures it—our own success, the success of our children, of our churches, of the community in which we live, of society as a whole? Is love our final test of salvation?

Above all, have we the heart of Christ? Does he set the tone of our feeling? Do we grieve as he grieved over loveless lives? Do we find our greatest happiness in the winning of new recruits to that great purpose of love to which he gave his life? Can we say with truth, as he said, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive"? If so—and only so—are we ready for the work to which he has called us as preachers of his salvation.

I thank thee, Lord, for strength of arm
To earn my bread,
And that beyond my need is meat
For friend unfed.
I thank thee much for bread to live,
I thank thee more for bread to give.

[1] Isa. 63:9.

[2] Phil. 2:7, 8.

I thank thee, Lord, for snug thatched roof
In cold and storm,
And that beyond my need is room
For friend forlorn.
I thank thee much for place to rest,
But more for shelter for my guest.

I thank thee, Lord, for lavish love
On me bestowed,
Enough to share with loveless folk,
To ease their load.
Thy love to me I ill could spare,
Yet dearer is the love I share.[1]

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

LUCIUS HOPKINS MILLER
Professor of Biblical Instruction, Princeton University

This is the third of a series of articles by Professor Miller dealing with Jesus. The others have been in the November number, "The Source of Our Information regarding the Life of Jesus," and in the February number, "The Life of Jesus in the Light of Modern Criticism." We suggest the reading of this article in connection with the sermon in this number by Dr. Ross.

So much is made of the supposed insufficiency and uncertainty of the Gospels that it is well to lay this bogy to rest at once, so far as the teaching of Jesus is concerned. Of course, we should like to have a much fuller record, but that is no reason for shutting our eyes to the fact that we have, nevertheless, a fairly large amount of reported teaching. But is it credibly reported? This question raises serious problems into which we cannot enter here. But the existence of these problems need not paralyze our practical judgment. We may leave much in doubt without depriving ourselves of the assurance that we do know, or can know, the main lines along which Jesus' thought ran. To be sure, Jesus spoke in Aramaic and all the Gospels were written in Greek. Further the accounts of what he said have certainly been colored by the minds through which the stream of tradition flowed. But let all be said that can be said, and we may still maintain that we know what Jesus taught.

A few words about interpretation. In interpreting the Bible many mistakes are made and many errors arise. Jesus' teaching has not been exempt from these things. It is so easy to see in a word what we wish to see in it, and it is so comfortable to insert our pet convictions in a verse, surreptitiously, and then to draw them out again triumphantly, with an air of scientific discovery and of divine authority. In interpreting the teaching of Jesus we must not change parables into allegories, seeking all sorts of complicated meanings where usually one great truth is to be found. We must remember that "the words of Jesus are important, not as precepts, but as indicative of principles," for he was not interested in regulating the outward life but in filling the soul with

[1] Davis, *The Better Prayer.*

divine enthusiasm. In fine, we must always be alive to the underlying principles and then regard them as revelations of Jesus' own mind; for he was not so much a teacher of spiritual life as a revealer of it. Thus Paul was quite right in emphasizing the spirit against the letter, and in this emphasis he followed in the footsteps of the Master.

Matthew Arnold, with his usual keenness of insight, realized that a dominant note in Jesus' words was that of *inwardness*. It does not require the insight of a Matthew Arnold to discern this, however. The most striking thing about Christianity has been its unerring tendency to lay its finger on the heart; on the thoughts, motives, impulses, and purposes of men; on all the inner cross- and counter-currents that go to make up our real life in the everyday world.

This element of Jesus' teaching most naturally appears in strongest light where the Jewish law is discussed. We are prone to think of Paul as the great protagonist of faith, the spirit, and the inner life, against dead works, the mere letter of life, and the externalism of legalism. In this we are right. Paul's fight meant the possibility of full freedom for the Christian movement, and his victory meant its realization. But we must remember that Paul was merely the captain who led the last assault in a campaign that had been conducted, indeed, for centuries; from the skirmishes of the Hebrew prophets to the fundamental plan of attack revealed in the Gospels by the greatest of spiritual commanders.

Jesus' attitude toward the law was prophetic, rather than scribal. That is, it was vital rather than formal, inward rather than outward, spiritual rather than literal. There is nothing more stirring or more searching in the whole Bible, nay, in all literature, than the series of antithetic passages in the fifth chapter of Matthew, beginning in each case, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time," and ending with, "But I say unto you." There is a sureness of aim here that begets confidence and wins admiration, both because of that which the shots destroy and that which they spare and defend. One is tempted to quote at length but a few verses must suffice: "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment. . . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."[1]

It may be that our usual idea of Paul, as a more outspoken antagonist of the law than Jesus, is due to his methods of presentation. However, to Paul the law was still "a slave to bring us unto Christ." Jesus, too, seems to have been

[1] Matt. 5:21–24, 27–28, 38–48. In this article I shall use, of course, only such teaching of Jesus as I consider genuine. One or two reservations will be indicated later. I may say, further, that the teaching selected, minor details aside, is not seriously questioned by those critics whose leadership is worthy of acceptance. The genuine teaching of Jesus far exceeds, in amount, that utilized here. Limits of space compel a selection. I have tried to make this selection thoroughly representative.

accustomed to send inquirers back to the law, bidding them seek light from it. But, close as these two ideas are, there is a difference. For Paul, the work of the law was done. It was all a thing of the past. Christ had ended it. The present was the age of the Spirit and there was a clear break between the two, of time as well as of quality. Jesus, on the contrary, seemed to think of the law, not as superseded, but as outgrowing itself, so to speak. In it were continually to be found the germinating seeds of a new life that was to fulfil the law. "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished."[1]

This is a strong passage and not without disquieting suggestions. The "jot and tittle" phraseology sounds altogether rabbinical, and it may be that we have here the work of some misguided Jewish Christian, anxious to save the orthodoxy of the Master. I am inclined to think this is the case. But, on the other hand, one of the guiding principles of a correct interpretation of Jesus' teaching is a recognition of his tendency to push a truth to the extreme, in order to get it out into the open, as it were, free from the inevitable background of expediency. The famous "turn the cheek" passage is an example of this, and it may be that the present passage is another. This does not seem at all likely, however, for the Jews did not need to be harangued into legalism, nor was Jesus at all interested in that sort of thing. The meaning may possibly be that the law contains the gist of the whole matter, therefore we cannot think of its passing away any more than of the disappearance of the eternal truth of which it is the bearer.

But we do not have to base on such disputable ground the thesis that Jesus sought and found, inside the law itself, the interpretative principle of the new life. In Matthew and in Luke we have parallel accounts of the famous question of the lawyer. "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do and thou shalt live."

The lawyer's answer to his own question was taken partly from Deuteronomy and partly from Leviticus, and Jesus stamped it with the seal of his approval.[2] On another occasion he expressed the opinion that "every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old."[3] In other words, the law is far from discarded. It is God's law and salvation is in it. "This do and thou shalt live." But the law must be interpreted according to a principle to be found within itself, a principle that has to do with the heart and the motives. A sifting pro-

[1] Matt. 5:17–20.

[2] Luke 10:25–28; Matt. 22:34–40; Deut. 6:4; Lev. 17:17–18.

[3] Matt. 13:52.

cess results by which the wheat of the permanent is separated from the temporary Jewish chaff.

Jesus did not content himself with mere enunciation of the principle, leaving the application to us. He applied it rigorously to the contemporaneous perversions which characterized Pharisaism, in language which has become classic. Indeed, orations of invective might quite as reasonably be called "rabbinics" as "philippics." When the Pharisees were quibbling about the relation of hand-washing to religion, Jesus uttered the trenchant saying, "There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man."[1] Elsewhere scorn is heaped upon rabbinical exaggeration and hypocrisy in words of cutting irony and indignant emotion. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full from extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also."[2]

This invective is directed against rabbinical refinements of the law, but it is clear that Jesus everywhere subordinates the legal and ceremonial elements of the original law to his inner principle and practically excludes them from consideration. Thus we see that Matthew Arnold was right in holding up inwardness as a fundamental mark of Christian teaching.

But mere inwardness is, to a large extent, a colorless term; a formal description without essential content. We now know where to look, but we do not yet know what to look for. To be sure, when we learn that righteousness is a thing of the heart and not a matter of washing pots, pans, cups, and platters, we have made progress. This progress carries us beyond and above the boggy levels of Pharisaism, but it does not bring us to the fork of the road where the peculiarly Christian path leads out. In other words, there are kinds of inwardness not distinctively Christian, and thus we see that Matthew Arnold's criterion is only a tentative and partial one, not final. "Out of the heart are the issues of life," no matter what those issues may be. Envy is quite as inward as benevolence. Hatred is quite as inward as love. Lust is just as much a thing of the heart as purity. "That which proceedeth out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness: all these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man."[3] Besides, Christianity is not the only religion that possesses this trait of inwardness. Both Brahmanism and Buddhism are essentially inward in their emphasis.

No, we must delve deeper into the teaching of Jesus if we are to fathom its unique depths. Can we find there distinctive meanings which will mark off the Christian life of the spirit from other kinds of spiritual life? Can we discern in his teaching thoughts that may be

[1] Mark 7:1–23. [2] Matt. 23.

[3] Mark 7:20–23; vss. 21–23 seem to be an expansion by the evangelist of the thought of Jesus in vs. 20.

described as characteristically Christian? In short, is there a peculiarly Christian inwardness, and, if so, what is it? To find what we seek we must answer the questions, "What does Jesus teach regarding God?" and, "What does He teach concerning man?" We may link to one or the other of these two queries all others that might conceivably be asked, such as those concerning sin, forgiveness, faith, salvation, the future life.

Let us first examine, therefore, the doctrine of Jesus concerning God. Most non-Christians, and many Christians, think of God as a God of power essentially. He is omniscient. He knows everything. He is omnipotent. He can do anything. It is well known how large this element looms in the Moslem conception of God. The recognition of fate and the inculcation of blind submission express this emphasis of Islam. The inscrutability of the all-powerful purposes of Allah and the uselessness of resisting them are cardinal Mohammedan doctrines.

In a similar way, the rabbis of late Judaism magnified the element of aloofness in God's nature. In the thought of the Jews, from the time of the Babylonian exile, the gap between Jehovah and his people tended to increase. The sense of sin and of its curse brought with it a sense of moral separation. The growing belief in intermediary beings emphasized this separation quite as much as did the connection between God and man. The whole relationship was usually conceived of in despotic terms which linked the aloofness of Jehovah with the essential thought of power. The Jews did not dare to use Jehovah's real name, "Jahwé." It was too sacred. They employed circumlocutions, or combined the consonants of that name with the vowels of another and less sacred name, "Adonai," thus creating the familiar but linguistically unjustifiable word, "Jehovah."

Jesus, on the other hand, emphasized other phases of the nature of God more strongly than that of power. Still we must not forget that the God of Jesus is clearly a powerful God. In the famous colloquy with his disciples regarding the future chances of rich men, Jesus asserts, "With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible."[1] The relative dreadfulness of falling into the hands of angry men or of an offended God is described in these undoubtedly genuine words: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, who after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him."[2] Elsewhere, simple trust is commended in the words of a nature lover, "Consider the lilies, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass in the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven; how much more shall He clothe you, O ye of little faith?"[3]

That everything is in God's hands, Jesus everywhere assumes and occasionally asserts. But there is nothing speculative about his assertions. Many of our theological garments have been woven with omnipotence as the warp

[1] Matt. 19:23–26. [2] Luke 12:4–5. [3] Luke 12:22–30; Matt. 6:25–34.

and omniscience the woof. This may do for sackcloth but not for work-a-day clothes. Jesus cut his cloth from another pattern. God is powerful—all-powerful, in fact—but his power is a practical and not a speculative matter. Like the Sabbath, "it was made for man and not man for it."

But Jesus' emphasis is not on power at all, but on the love of God. The special term he used for God, the name "Father," which has ever since been considered distinctively Christian, symbolizes beautifully both the inclusiveness of Jesus' conception and its special interest. The name was not a new one. It appears several times in the Old Testament and was not unfamiliar to the rabbis; but with Jesus it seems to have taken on a new connotation. But even his meaning was not absolutely new. Hosea, Jeremiah, and Second Isaiah, among others, had stressed the loving phase of Jehovah's nature. Still, the depth and range of God's gracious love are so much greater in the Gospels that they stamp the whole conception as something new. New it still is, in large part. After two thousand years of training, even Christian theory still finds it hard to survive at the altitude of the Sermon on the Mount, and Christian practice lags far behind its theory. "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . . Whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him two. . . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, ... that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven."[1]

Love, in the specially Christian sense, in the sense determined by God's own nature, is graciousness, kindliness, and helpfulness to those who cannot or will not require it. Grasp this and you are ready to understand the heart of the gospel of Jesus. The gist of the parable of the Prodigal Son is in the very phase of the story which causes many to sympathize with the elder brother. The whole point is the very lack of desert in the Prodigal, his previous selfishness and ingratitude, and his present inability to offer his father anything but a contrite heart. "And he arose and came to his father . . . . his father saw him, and was moved with compassion. . . . . And the son said, Father, I have sinned . . . . I am no more worthy to be called thy son. . . . . But the father said, ... let us . . . . make merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found."[2]

The ethical difficulties in the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard are solved in the same way. The parable is introduced with the words, "For the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that was a householder." The householder is the central figure of the story and, in him, one characteristic is featured, namely, the desire to help others needlessly. The parable does not show perfect literary execution, but it is not lacking in clarity. It teaches the free, boundless, uncalculating graciousness of the Father.[3]

The unapproachably beautiful parable of the Good Samaritan leads in the same direction by a different path. The

[1] Matt. 5:38–48. [2] Luke 15:11–32. [3] Matt. 20:1–16.

virtue of the Samaritan consisted in his rising above the ordinary separations of life by means of a broad, human sympathy. The prologue of the parable connects this sort of neighborly love with a right relation to God and consequently presupposes the existence of the same quality in God himself.[1]

Wherever we touch the teaching of Jesus, we feel this throbbing sympathy, expressed or implied. It is not strange, therefore, that the symbol, "Father," was his favorite name for God, for it expresses most aptly Jesus' supreme interest in the practical relation of God to the world: a relation of good-will, which is the essential content of the "inwardness" of God.

But, can we not go farther in analyzing the content of this good-will? No doubt we are learning more about it all the time. The revelation of God's love is not yet complete. It is growing with the consciousness of the race. Each generation adds details to fill out the concept. But Jesus did not leave all this to those who should come after Him. He himself tells us a number of important things.

For instance, we learn that the love which the Father expects from his children, namely, his own loving kindness, is not a weak and pliant thing. It must not be confused with softness. The Father hates sin. "If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into hell."[2] Though his sympathy is as wide as the horizon, and as deep as the ocean, it does not and cannot separate sin from punishment. "And if thy right hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body go into hell."[3] These and other stern passages do not enable us to paint the picture in detail. In fact, we are told not to judge, "that ye be not judged." The court dealing with such things is one over which we are not called to preside; but we must hold, if only as a word of admonition, that Jesus' conception of God includes some relation to "the wages of sin."

Further, we learn that God's love is of a sort that demands purity of heart. "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God."[4] It generates a modest willingness to sink fame and personal glory in glad service of others. "And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be servant of all. For the Son of Man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."[5] It demands a peace-loving disposition, "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God";[6] singleness of purpose, "The lamp of the body is the eye; if therefore thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body

[1] Luke 10:25–37.
[2] Matt. 5:29.
[3] Matt. 5:30.
[4] Matt. 5:8.
[5] Mark 10:42–45.
[6] Matt. 5:9.

shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness! No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."[1]

The divine love is of a sort that can work only through obedient wills. In fact, it is only through action prompted by obedience to the divine impulse that this God-like structure can be built up. "Every one therefore that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man, who built his house upon the rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon the rock. And every one that heareth these words of mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and smote upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall thereof."[2] Finally, this love includes a whole-souled and eager devotion to righteousness, hungering and thirsting, as it were, for everything good. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled."[3] The nature of these demands reveals the nature of the love that makes them, and in these things is the true love from God made manifest.

The patience and persistence of true love is clearly indicated in the words, "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you."[4] These qualities Jesus pre-eminently embodied in his own life, alike in his relations with slow-minded disciples and exasperating enemies.

He often insists on the forgiving spirit, also, as part and parcel of a love that shares the divine nature. "Then came Peter and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven."[5] Then follows the condemnation of the "Unmerciful Servant." Lastly, true love, the love characteristic of the Father, inevitably entails suffering. There is in it something essentially vicarious, something that involves suffering with and for others. "And he began to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But he, turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men. And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his

[1] Matt. 6:22–24.
[2] Matt. 7:24–27.
[3] Matt. 5:6.
[4] Matt. 5:10–12.
[5] Matt. 18:21–22; 5:43–48; 6:12–15.

cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it. . . . ."[1]

The Cross is not merely an essential part of the original gospel. It is an essential element in every man's true appropriation of the "Good News," because it is essential to the "things of God." When, therefore, we speak of love without including in our conception lines of demarkation—separations, hardness, suffering—we substitute for the true conception a soft, emasculated sentimentality which is quite a different thing. We mind "not the things of God, but the things of men."

The distinctive thing, therefore, about Jesus' emphasis upon love in the character of God is not its separation from other ethical qualities and its exaltation in disregard of them, or at their expense. It is, rather, that all possible virtues are subsumed under this all-controlling principle in which they become fused, by which they are energized, and through which a proper balance may be secured in their exercise. In a sense, the thought of God and of his demands is thus immensely simplified, in that the eye may be focused on one point instead of on many. But this is truly a terrible simplicity. It is so rich, varied, many-sided, and all-embracing, and hence so hard to acquire. These things enable us to understand how two diverse and apparently contradictory sayings of Jesus may both be true, namely, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; . . . . for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light"; and, "Enter ye in by the narrow gate: . . . . for narrow is the gate and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life."[2]

We must not forget to add a word regarding Jesus' conception of God's relation to the physical universe. Man's conquest of nature has caused many terrors to vanish like a morning cloud, but others have arisen to take their place. Whatever the development of science, man will never entirely conquer nature. On the contrary, nature is bound to conquer man, sooner or later; at death, if not before. A religion that does not meet the needs arising from this condition cannot permanently satisfy the heart of man. In this connection, Jesus everywhere builds on the basis already laid down by the Hebrew prophets. His teaching, as usual, is practical and not speculative. He assumes that God is the creator of the universe and clearly teaches that the universe is good because it is God's work. There is no essential gap between this phase of things and the human phase. Both alike are objects of his loving care. "Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life. . . . . Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?"[3]

This leads naturally to another element in Jesus' conception of God, and with this we may conclude. In Jesus' thought, the Father was very near to him. This sense of the nearness of God

[1] Mark 8:31–35. In this passage the specific nature of the resurrection prediction is probably due to the evangelist.

[2] Matt. 11:28–30; 7:13–14.

[3] Matt. 6:26–30.

was one of the characteristics which marked him off from his contemporaries. They prayed publicly and elaborately. He sought silence and solitude in which to meet his Father. "He withdrew himself into the deserts and prayed."[1] In silence and in solitude he cultivated simplicity in prayer. "And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites: for they love to stand and pray in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. . . . . But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thine inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret."[2] Why use many words? The Father is there and knoweth your needs before you ask. In simple heart-confession we should lay our needs before God with the sincerity and desire of the Publican, knowing that God is near and will hear the cry of the soul. To Jesus, God was an all-powerful and an all-righteous God, but he was especially the all-loving and ever-present one. This is the particular content of Jesus' thought of God and of the symbol "Father" which he has made distinctively Christian.

What did Jesus teach concerning man; his nature, place, and destiny? We have already answered this question, in part, while setting forth Jesus' conception of God. It is important to call attention to the fact that this overlapping in the presentation is due largely to the complete fusion of the ethical and religious elements of life in Jesus' view of things. This fusion is one of the central facts of Christian teaching; a fact which allies it closely with Hebrew prophetism and clearly distinguishes them both, in degree, if not in kind, from all other historic religious viewpoints. In other words, Christianity is not merely an ethical system. It is, rather, an ethico-religious life.

But we can, and we must, say much more than has been said about Jesus' teaching concerning man's nature, relations, and destiny. The filial nature of man is the natural corollary which Jesus drew from his paternal conception of God. Man is the child of God, the son of the Father. "I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven." "Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister and mother." "Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for to such belongeth the Kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein."[3]

In a sense, all men are sons of the Father; that is, potentially. Throughout his life and teaching, while limiting his work almost entirely to members of his own race, Jesus evidently deals with man as man. The Good Samaritan steps across the high barrier between his people and the Jews and is commended therefor. Jesus recognizes the great faith of the Roman centurion with the striking words, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."[4] Human life, as such, possesses worth and dignity and is full of boundless possibilities. There is not an absolute difference of kind between the human spirit and the

[1] Luke 5:16.

[2] Matt. 6:5–15.

[3] Matt. 5:43–48; 18:1–3; Mark 3:31–35; 10:13–15.

[4] Matt. 8:10–12.

divine; no complete gap or break that needs to be artificially bridged. Jesus accepted the old Hebrew thought expressed in one of the creation stories, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him."[1]

In man as man, therefore, resides an infinite capacity God-ward. This gives a basis for endless effort, not only in self-development, but also in behalf of others. This faith in man also is itself a progress-producing conviction, for men will attack the most difficult problems if only they can believe that a solution is possible. Jesus was never tired of helping those about him, even the most despised and degenerate, because he saw in them the possibilities of Christian sonship. This is the basal idea of man which he tried to inculcate by precept and example, "Every one is worthful."

This worth is due, however, to the kind of life of which man is capable, even though he may not yet be the possessor of it; namely, the divine life. It is due to the fact that he is a potential child of God, even though actual sonship is yet to be achieved. In a real sense, man as man *is* a child of God and in another sense, equally real, he must *become* a child of God. "Verily I say unto you, Except ye turn, and *become* as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."[2] "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."[3] This must be taken in the light of the context and can only mean, "Ye shall be controlled by the same loving purpose which controls the Father." That is, man *becomes* a son of God by submitting willingly and joyfully to the divine will which is one of uncalculating love. In becoming a child of the Father, he becomes like God in this particular. In other words, the divine element in man is not different from the divine element above man. There is but one principle for both, and what God is in respect to that principle, man may become. This is his manifest destiny.

No conception of human nature could be more exalted, and yet it does not ignore the hard facts of life. It transcends them, not by ignoring, but by conquering them. Ignorance, filth, vice, and disease often force us to ask whether the ideal of actual divine sonship is at all possible. In many cases it seems like a utopian dream; and yet, history and present-day experience afford us ample testimony to the power of God in bringing men to himself, even out of apparently hopeless conditions. The justification of this faith must be sought in a progressive realization of the ideal among men, in signs that this process is really taking place.

This ideal of divine sonship is realized whenever loving service, of an entirely disinterested sort, goes forth from man to man. Here is the fusion of the ethical and the religious in Jesus' teaching. In the Old Testament, "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as

[1] Gen. 1:26–27. [2] Matt. 18:3. [3] Matt. 5:48.

thyself" appear in different books. In the gospels, Jesus is represented as bringing them together.[1] Throughout all his teaching these two truths are inseparable. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me."[2] Brotherly love is the central and controlling ethical principle. Faithful devotion to the will of God is the religious principle. But each is the converse of the other and its complement. In Jesus' teaching, and in true, complete, Christian living, they are not sundered.

The teaching of Jesus was promulgated by him under the Jewish caption, "The kingdom of heaven." "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven." "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed . . . . leaven . . . . a treasure hid in a field . . . . a merchant seeking goodly pearls." "She saith unto him, Command that these my two sons may sit, one on thy right hand, and one thy left hand, in thy kingdom. . . . . But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister . . . ."[3]

It may be that Jesus thought of the future establishment of the kingdom in a somewhat Jewish way; that is, a kingdom to be miraculously set up by God himself soon after Jesus' death. Certainly we must beware of modernizing his conception by reading into it social ideas which are current today. This is a knotty problem, and perhaps an insoluble one. We do not have to wait for its solution, however, for whatever conclusion we reach, all must agree that the kingdom was to Jesus a spiritual thing, fundamentally. It signified the inner union of man with God and with his fellow-man; a great, congenial family of men at one with God and devoted to the execution of his will.

All Jesus' teaching concerning the fundamental issues of religion should be interpreted in the light of the controlling emphasis already mentioned. Sin is anything that interferes with true sonship. It is not so much an act as an attitude. Hence, pride and hypocrisy may be worse than sins usually deemed much baser. Righteousness, too, is not a mosaic of correct performances, but a rightly directed personal attitude. Personality is indivisible and so is righteousness; a personal thing which exceeds the "righteousness" of the scribes and Pharisees in that it is inward, real, sincere, and freed from the thought of self by being itself, essentially, regard for the welfare of others. Forgiveness flows forth from the ever-ready love of God to everyone who sincerely repents. When thus received, it necessarily propagates, in and through the recipient, the forgiving spirit. Repentance is the portal to the kingdom, as with John the Baptist, and forgiveness the joyous expe-

[1] Deut. 6:4–5; Lev. 19:18; Luke 10:25–29.

[2] Matt. 25:31–46.

[3] Matt. 5:3; 8:11; 13:31–33, 44–47; 20:20–28.

rience of an actual child of God, the fact of being, or of becoming, reconciled with him.

Finally, his conception of salvation and of the judgment is inextricably bound up with the kingdom idea. If the Jewish emphasis was controlling, then the idea of *future* salvation and judgment must have been Jesus' paramount thought. That the future was included in his teaching on these subjects seems clear to me, but the content of this teaching is not so clear. We may say with perfect assurance, however, that whether present or future, in this world or in the beyond, or both, salvation and judgment could have had only one qualitative meaning for Jesus. When Zaccheus rises to a nobler plane of motive, Jesus cries, "Today is salvation come to this house." And elsewhere he says, "He that loses his life shall save it and he that saveth his life shall lose it." Salvation comes by losing oneself in the all-compelling purpose of the Father's kingdom, and judgment rests on him who treasures his own life for its own sake and is loath to let it go.

The kingdom concept, as adopted by Jesus, necessarily implies a social reference and emphasis, but it is not social in the current sense of that word. Jesus' teaching was primarily individualistic; but it affords ground for, and imparts a great impetus to, an extended social application.

Such was Jesus' teaching, and, as we saw at the beginning, such must have been his life; for these sayings have a flavor about them betraying the fact that they have been *lived* out, not *thought* out, merely. Had Jesus been a mere teacher, whose life did not especially exemplify what he taught, we might be justified in maintaining that the essence of Christianity lies in the controlling ideas of his teaching. But it is evident that Jesus lived out what he taught, and that it is the spirit of his actual life, even more than of his sublime teaching, that has given us historical Christianity. Thus the church has been right in insisting on the person of Christ as central. Of course we must change our formulae, for we are now obliged to approach this religious question, and all others, from a standpoint far different from that of our ancestors. But the cardinal thing about Christianity is still the fact that "the Word became flesh and dwelt among us," and the cardinal experience awaiting each one of us, if we have not already had it, is to behold "his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth."

AN ATTEMPT AT A SCIENTIFIC CLASSIFICATION OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE[1]

GEORGE A. BARTON, PH.D.
Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages, Bryn Mawr College

To one who looks at the Bible from the standpoint of any other literature it seems to have a unity both of purpose and of style. This is recognized by writers so diverse in their interests as von Soden[2] and Gardiner.[3] This unity comes in part from the intensity with which the biblical writers felt the reality of the deepest inner life, and in part from the fact that the book from beginning to end is so largely dominated by the point of view and the culture of Palestine.

No one who approaches the study of the Bible closely, however, can remain unaware that it is not a book, but a library, containing a considerable variety of literature. There is history, poetry, philosophy, biography, and epistolary literature. It seems at first an easy task to classify this library and put each kind of literature into its proper alcove, and, like a good administrator of the Dewey library system, place over each alcove its proper number from 1 to 1,000. When, however, one approaches the task, as I am asked to do, and make a scientific classification of this library from the literary point of view, he finds it a different matter.

The older classification into historical, prophetic, poetical, and epistolary books is obviously inadequate. "Prophetic" can be applied to such books as Daniel and Revelation, only if used in a very different sense from that applicable to Amos and Hosea. Some of the books which used to be counted as historical are not histories, but laws. Large sections of the prophets and fragments of the historical books are poetical, and deserve to be so called as much as Job or the Psalms. Some of the so-called Epistles, as Hebrews and James, are obviously not letters at all, but slightly disguised orations.

The modern critical analysis, which enables us to treat of J, E, D, and P, and to separate editorial material from the oracles of the prophets, seems, at first sight, to make classification easier, but does not in reality enable one to carry it through, for after all our analysis one form of literature blends into another in many of the writings and defies classification. This is why the books on the history of the literature of ancient Israel, such as Budde's *Geschichte der althebräischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1906, and Fowler's *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, New York, 1912, attempt no classification, but endeavor to trace the genetic origins of existing writings.

The most obvious literary distinction

[1] A paper read at a conference of collegiate and secondary-school Bible teachers, December 30, 1913.

[2] *History of Early Christian Literature* (New York and London, 1906), p. 9.

[3] *The Bible as English Literature* (New York, 1907), p. 2.

with which to begin a classification of any literature is the division between prose and poetry, but this distinction is applied to the books of the Bible only with great difficulty, partly because of the mixture already mentioned, and partly because of differences of opinion as to what in Hebrew actually constitutes poetry. The late David Heinrich Müller[1] held that most of the prophetic writings were not only in poetry, but that they exhibited a highly complicated poetical structure, while Sievers[2] will have it that large parts of Genesis, which to less highly attuned intellects seem to be prose, are really poetry. One wonders if the sensitive perceptions of the last mentioned investigator would not find poetry in the *Century Dictionary* or the latest edition of the *New York Telephone Book.*

Even if experts may differ as to where the line between prose and poetry should be drawn, doubtless there is such a line. We may then take the first step in an attempted classification by dividing the poetical material from the prose. Among the Hebrews, as among other nations, the poetry developed first; we accordingly consider it first.

The poetry of the Bible may obviously be divided into lyric, epic, elegiac, and didactic; whether we may add dramatic is in dispute.

As lyric poems we may enumerate the Song of Lamech, the Song of the Well, the Song of Hannah, the Psalms, the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc dimittis*, the Song of Zachariah, and many passages of the Prophets, such as Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard. The lyric poetry begins in the celebration of external events, such as the digging of a well, or the invention of the art of metal-working, and passes, as in the Psalter, to the expression of the deepest emotions of the soul.

It is often said that the Hebrews had no epic poetry. If we mean by epic long-sustained poetical treatment of a great theme or cycle of events, such as are treated in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, Gilgamesh Epic, the *Aeneid*, or *Paradise Lost*, the Hebrews had no epic poetry; but, if we take the strict literary classification, which restricts the term lyric to poetry which expresses the emotions or feelings of the singer, and classes as epic all poetry which describes external events, then the Song of Deborah, the *Mashals* of Baalam, the song of the *Mosh^elim*, or Hebrew rhapsodists, in Num. 21:27–30, the Song of Miriam, the Blessing of Jacob, and the Blessing of Moses are all epic poems. Elegy is represented by the Lament of David over Saul and Jonathan, by the Book of Lamentations, and by numerous passages in the prophets, such as,

Yahweh roars from Zion and from Jerusalem utters his voice
And the pastures of the shepherds shall mourn, and the top of Carmel wither (Amos 1:2),

and the poem in Isa. 47, beginning:

Come down and sit in the dust, virgin daughter of Babylon
Sit on the ground disenthroned, daughter of the Chaldaeans.

Didactic poetry is represented by the Book of Proverbs, the Wisdom of the

[1] *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, Wien, 1896.

[2] *Studien zur hebräischen Metrik*, Leipzig, 1901.

Son of Sirach, the poetical parts of Ecclesiastes, and by numerous oracles of the prophets. The elevated passion of the prophets often bore them into that rhythmic form of expression which is the heart of Hebrew poetry. Sometimes this expression was lyric, sometimes didactic, and sometimes elegiac. Indeed there are those who contend that all that is not poetic is editorial addition. Jeremiah, who could not write, was one of Israel's greatest souls, and is often poetic. Baruch, his stenographer, seems to have had as little poetry in his soul as some of the modern representatives of his profession, and in the hands of later editors Baruch's prose has sometimes become one seven times more prosaic than it was wont to be; but nevertheless even in Jeremiah poetry is to be found.

The greatest of all biblical poems is the Book of Job, a poem which treats a perennially vital theme in a most masterly way, a poem too great to be rightly classified. That it is didactic goes without saying. That there is in it action of a high order cannot be denied; but it is not a drama in the technical sense. It was never intended to be acted. Four men sitting on a dunghill and disagreeing with one another about eternal themes do not constitute a play. Professor Genung's designation, "The Epic of the Inner Life," most aptly describes it. It really falls into no common category. It is *sui generis* and must be placed by itself apart. It is, nevertheless, when the Bible is viewed simply as literature, the greatest piece of literature in the Bible. Its visage has been somewhat marred by editorial additions, but these can easily be detected. The teacher who would arouse the interest of the non-religious literary student in the Bible as literature has in the Book of Job his strongest ally.

Another poem difficult to classify is the Song of Songs. That it is not an allegory, as was thought from the time of Rabbi Aqiba down to the last century, one need not now waste time to prove. Scientific students of the Bible are no longer tempted to hold this view. But what is it? Is it a drama? This has often been held by scholars since 1616, when Caspar Sanctius first suggested it. Some have regarded it as a sacred drama; some as a secular. So eminent a scholar as Ewald held to the dramatic theory of Canticles, and such eminent names as those of Driver, Koenig, and Duhm may be counted among the living advocates of this view. Nevertheless it is not a drama. The advocates of the dramatic theory have never been able to agree as to how the supposed drama should be divided into acts and scenes, as to who the speakers are, what the plot is, where the action takes place, or how it is carried out. They have to suppose that the lover is spoken to as a present person when he is absent, that the Shunemite encourages Solomon's passion by her words, when she is really rejecting it. Entire scenes have to be regarded as dreams, and a secondary stage has to be resorted to as incidental to scenes that would not occupy two minutes. The scenes are too short to be acted. If it be a drama, the work is without parallel in any literature.[1]

[1] Cf. Schmidt, *Messages of the Poets* (New York, 1911), p. 222.

Wetzstein[1] and Budde[2] have developed the theory that Canticles is an epithalamium or collection of songs sung during the week of a wedding festival, when, after oriental fashion, the bridal pair play at being king and queen. This view has been accepted by Siegfried[3] and others. According to this view the songs treat of wedded love, and include *wasfs* in praise of the bride, and groom, and their early wedded experiences. This view is, however, as untenable as the other. Many passages show that wedded love is not the theme at all. In 2:8–17 the lover peeps in through the window; he is, then, not a bridegroom. In 3:1–5 the love-lorn woman runs through the streets asking for her lover that she may bring him to her mother's house; she is, then, not a bride. In 5:2–9 she is alone in bed, and after her lover has knocked at the door and she has declined to let him in, goes out in search of him and is insulted by the city watchmen—certainly not an ordinary scene from a honeymoon!

We conclude, therefore, with Professor Schmidt,[4] that the book is a collection of love lyrics, in which the elemental passion is artistically praised, as it is in Theocritis, without reference to conventions or the laws of matrimony. The poems have received some additions from editors, and have suffered somewhat in transmission, but are purely lyrical.

Biblical poetry, then, falls into the four divisions, lyric, epic, elegiac, and didactic.

Of the prose compositions of the Bible historiography constitutes the largest division. These writings are not histories in the modern scientific sense of the word, but are, like the work of Herodotus, historiographical writings of the ancient type. In such writings a dominant purpose might dictate the selection of materials and the treatment of the subject, and shape the result. These writings come from centuries scattered over a thousand years of time, and range from the matchless stories of the "Unknown Homer of the Hebrews," whom we designate the J document, to the idealistic Memorabilia of Jesus called the Gospel of John. Sometimes the interest of the writer is legal, as was that of the author of the P document, and his narrative forms but a brief setting to his code, and corresponds to the Code of Hammurabi, with its prologue and epilogue.

Another writer, though his interest is legal, was an orator by nature, and with marked literary ability transforms his code into an impressive address, which constitutes the Book of Deuteronomy. The authors of Kings and Chronicles were interested in special forms of religion, and conceived history in accordance with the demands of that religion. The interest of ancient historians was always personal and concrete, so these books are a galaxy of personal portraits—Moses, Joshua, Deborah, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson, Samuel, Saul, David, Jesus, in the Gospels, and Paul in the Acts of the Apostles. In ancient historiography the line between myth and history is not closely drawn. The Hebrews, like other nations, had their heroic age, which

[1] *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, 1873, pp. 170 f.

[2] *New World*, 1894; Marti's *Hand-Kommentar*.

[3] Nowack's *Kommentar*.

[4] *Op. cit.*, 228 f.

included legends of the patriarchs, and myths of Paradise, the divinely begotten heroes (Gen. 6:2–4), the tower of Babel, the antediluvian patriarchs, etc. In another way at a later time the line between history and myth was lost, and a Babylonian allegory, based on a Babylonian myth, was transformed by a Jewish nomenclature into the Book of Esther, and regarded as history. Another class of prose writing contained in the Bible is the epistolary. Here, of course, we place the Epistles of Paul, and the general Epistles of the New Testament. These have the same general form as other ancient letters, and have long been compared as to form with the letters of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, and others, but the many letters in Greek, from the general period of the New Testament, which the sands of Egypt have in recent years yielded up, throw unexpected light upon the epistolary form of literature, and make it possible to arouse new interest in its study. There are differences in the New Testament letters. Some of them are real letters, called out by definite occasions; such certainly are the epistles to the Thessalonians and Galatians. Some, however, are not letters in the real sense of the term. Von Soden[1] claims that all of the post-Pauline letters are not, strictly speaking, letters at all; they were not called out by the concrete needs of a particular moment of time. Torrey[2] has shown that the Epistle to the Hebrews is not a letter, but an early Christian sermon, to which some editor attached at a later time an epistolary beginning and ending. The same is probably true of the Epistle of James. Letters here merge into oratory.

Another class of biblical literature is the prophetic. We have already found in the prophets lyric and didactic poetry. They also contain oratory of a high order, as may be seen from reading Isa., chaps. 40–45, together with much editorial material. Mixed as the contents of the prophetic books are, however, they form a class of literature by themselves, a class difficult to define by reason of this mixture, yet pervaded by a definite and deeply religious purpose.

Closely related to prophecy is apocalypse, which now must be recognized as a distinct class of writing. It is true that prophetic books sometimes approach apocalypse, as in Isa., chaps. 24–27, and Zech., chaps. 1–8, but nevertheless apocalypse is a form apart. It is in the Bible represented by Daniel and the Book of Revelation alone, but outside the Canon by numerous examples, such as the Book of Enoch, the Book of the Secrets of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Baruch, IV Esdras, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumption of Moses, the Ascension of Isaiah, etc. Canonical apocalypse cannot profitably be taught apart from a knowledge of these, and a knowledge of the principles of apocalyptic writing which a study of these reveals.

Another class of literature is the short story. As in modern times, so among the Hebrews, the story was usually told for a purpose. Ruth, Jonah, and Esther are biblical short stories, to which, if we include the apocrypha, we should add

[1] *History of the Early Christian Literature*, 202.

[2] *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXX, 137–56.

Tobit and Judith. Ruth was written to show that non-Israelitish wives were not undesirable, but had become mothers of most notable Israelites; Esther, to justify the observance of Purim; Jonah as a missionary tract. Its author by the use of allegory made fun of Israel for her unwillingness to carry out the ideal of service set forth in Isa., chap. 53. We lose his humor by taking his fish literally, but he intended it to provoke a smile.

Our survey has made it clear that the Bible contains lyric, epic, elegiac, and didactic poetry, historiography, letters, prophecy, and apocalypse. It has also made it clear that in some of the biblical books these are so mingled that the book might be put in two or more categories. Indeed, from these categories we could make up still another, orations which would consist of Deuteronomy, Hebrews, James, and large sections of the prophetic writings. Any attempt to pigeonhole each writing in one compartment only is doomed to failure, because impossible.

In conclusion, permit me to point out that, though Israel had no poetical epic of like extent to the *Iliad* or the *Aeneid*, the teacher of the Bible as literature cannot afford to lose sight of the epic significance of the Hexateuch as it now stands. While not in poetic form, it is epic in conception, and the epic of no other nation is as magnificently conceived. The world and man are formed; man loses his Eden; in discovering the arts man becomes corrupt; ultimately the flood destroys him. The descendants of Noah, like the earlier descendants of Adam, corrupt themselves, so God chooses to prepare a special people for his service. Then follow the choice of Abraham, the epic fortunes of his descendants through famine, bondage, and release, the giving of the law amid the volcanic terrors of Sinai, the waverings and wanderings in the wilderness, and the conquest of Canaan. The whole world becomes but the theater of the epic which places the chosen people in the promised land. The campaign against Troy, or the wanderings of Odysseus or Aeneas sink into insignificance in comparison with this theme, which might well be called from Creation to Canaan. We miss an opportunity to impress upon our students the literary and religious genius of Israel, if in our zeal for documents and redactors we let them miss the masterly sweep and significance of Israel's prose epic.

In reality the Hexateuch is but the first book of a greater epic, the fortunes and mission of Israel. The author of Isa., chap. 53, saw in vision something of the splendid vistas of service through suffering which was to constitute the theme of the later books of Israel's epic. His vision, too ideal for a nation ever to realize, was crystallized in the Person of the great Suffering Servant of the New Testament, who gave it new vitality and significance, and who said of His followers: "As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world." Through Him the epic which began in the Hexateuch is still being lived. It not only welds the Bible into an epic, giving it the unity to which attention was called at the beginning, but it adds all Christian history to the same great story. Thus the student who begins with literature, if rightly taught, should see in the classroom a new

vision of how he may, as a social worker, or a student volunteer, or a preacher of the gospel, or a Christian citizen, enter as a character into the epic, the final books of which can never be written till the kingdom of God shall come.

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON
Principal of the University of Chicago High School

Study IX. Speech: Slang and Profanity

Our home training, our education, our character are constantly being reflected by our speech. Men's judgment of us is more likely to be based upon how we speak and what we say than upon anything else. Men's judgment of each other in this respect may sometimes be wrong, but it is generally correct. A man's speech usually betrays his inner life. What he thinks determines what he is, and what he thinks determines what he says. "Out of the abundance of the heart," said Jesus, "the mouth speaketh." Think of the people you know best and see if this is not so in their cases.

The characteristics of speech include not only the words used, but the tone of the voice and the inflection given to the spoken words. These are first acquired by imitation and early become fixed habits. Members of the same family often show marked similarities in tone and manner of speech. Certain differences of pronunciation of the vowels mark the person born in New England, in the South, and in other parts of the country, so that one may tell pretty accurately from another's speech in what region he has lived. Certain words and phrases mark certain localities. The New Englander "guesses," the Southerner "reckons." Give some other illustrations.

What is the value of an agreeable voice? Think of the teachers you have had, the preachers and other public speakers you have listened to. Has the quality of their voices had anything to do with their effect upon you? You must have known some boy who was a bully among his fellows. Did his voice and manner of speech give any clue to his character? Apply the same test to any brutal or vulgar person whom you have seen.

What are the qualities of voice and manner of speech that seem to you most attractive and effective in others? Are not these worth your striving hard to secure? If you have already fallen into other habits it is not an easy task. How will you go about it?

However desirable a pleasing voice

and manner of speech may be, these are of far less importance than the words spoken. If one has thoughts worth expressing they are most effective when expressed in clear, direct speech. A vocabulary large enough to express careful distinctions in thought is necessary and should be used with discrimination. Discuss the training in English which you have received in school, with especial reference to the value of composition and extemporaneous speaking. One ought constantly to be enlarging the stock of words which he can use. One of the axioms which we laid down when we were studying habit will help us greatly. Use the word you wish to add to your vocabulary at the earliest opportunity and find several occasions to use it. It will then become a permanent acquisition.

The habit of using slang is very common. Where does slang originate? Does it serve any useful purpose? Would a newspaper account of a baseball game be as interesting and effective if written without slang? It might be a valuable exercise to translate such a "story" into the sort of English that your teacher in the high school would approve. Some slang expressions may seem to be more expressive and picturesque in a particular case than any other words. The chief objection to slang is that it is usually made to serve too wide a use and to take the place of more carefully selected words. At the present time such inane expressions as "I should worry" and "I should say" are heard on every hand and indicate either that the speaker has no thoughts to express or has fallen into a most unfortunate habit of concealing such thoughts as he has.

Whatever defense may be offered for the use of slang there is absolutely no excuse for profanity. Among the Ten Commandments we find "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless who taketh his name in vain." Was profanity wrong before the Ten Commandments were written? Would it be wrong now if the commandment had never been written? The real essence of profanity is irreverence. Why is irreverence sinful? Read the teaching of Jesus on this in Matt. 5:33–37. What did he mean when he said, "But let your communication be yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil"?

Swearing is a habit easily acquired and not easily broken. The habitual swearer does not think of the meaning of his words, but uses them to give emphasis to his speech. In this respect swearing is like slang, showing lack of discrimination in the use of language. Is swearing less wicked because used without thought of the real meaning of the words? Boys are not likely to swear in the presence of their mothers or others for whom they have respect. What does this show?

What kind of people are most addicted to profanity? In what places are you most likely to hear it? Why is profanity so frequent in connection with athletics? There is probably more swearing in football than in connection with any other game. Why? Football coaches often swear at a player who makes a misplay, and "cursing up" a team between the halves is a frequent practice and is supposed to put "pep" into a team. Many schools would not tolerate such a thing, and a coach would

send from the field a player who was profane. Would such a team be less likely to win? Would you rather play on such a team?

You may know of some strong and able man who uses profanity. Is this characteristic of such men? Does it add to their strength or is it a hindrance to them?

Study X. Clean Thinking and Speaking

We have said in an earlier study that the mind is like the sensitive plate of the photographer. If you will consider, you will see that this plate is much more sensitive to some impressions than to others. It probably took a good many exposures to fix permanently in your mind the multiplication tables or the inflection of a Latin verb. Other impressions you will find there, still vivid, from a single exposure. I recall vividly the words of a "smutty" song which I heard when a boy which I have never repeated in speech, but which I can never forget. Many things which I once learned laboriously and which I would gladly remember, I cannot recall. We cannot always avoid hearing improper speech, nor keep from having improper thoughts. We can avoid seeking and dwelling upon them. Examine your own mind and see whether you enjoy thinking of these things.

A self-controlled man has control of his thoughts as well as of his words and other outward acts. Two helps may be suggested. First, avoid whatever suggests impure thoughts. What are some of these? Second, keep your mind busy with wholesome things. Athletic games are of great value because they give boys so much to think and talk about. What else do you think of that serves the same purpose? Perhaps you have discovered that it is more difficult to control your thoughts at certain times or in certain places. The condition of your body has much to do with this. If you take plenty of exercise, do not overeat, sleep with your window open, get up when you first wake and take a bath, a cold one preferably, you will find it easy to keep your body strong and your mind clean. You will find these matters fully and helpfully treated in *From Youth to Manhood*, by Dr. Winfield S. Hall, published by the Y.M.C.A. Press, New York.

As we have seen, clean speech follows clean thought. While it may be that a person of unclean thought may not always give expression to these thoughts, a person whose inner life is clean will not use unclean speech. "Smutty" story-telling and other forms of vulgar speech are very common among boys, and it is easy to fall into the habit without realizing how demoralizing are its effects. The gymnasium locker-rooms, school corridors, fraternity houses, poolrooms, and other places where boys gather by themselves offer frequent opportunity for such talk. In what places and under what circumstances have you heard or used such language? Boys sometimes think it is a sign of smartness or manliness to use vulgar language. This is more likely to be the case if the captain of the team or some other prominent boy has this habit. Discuss the responsibility which this places upon the captain.

If you have made up your mind that unclean speech is wrong, what can and

ought you to do about it? You can and must keep your own speech clean. The habit of clean speech once formed is a safeguard against much that is degrading. But is this enough? What should you do when others use "smutty" language? A group of boys in school drew up and signed an agreement that they would not use vulgar language and would not allow another to use it in their presence without protest. The result was an immediate lessening of the amount of "smut" in that school. Would such decision and action in your "bunch" make you unpopular? If so, would it not be better for you to get out of the "bunch"? A certain boy to whom another had made an improper proposal told him never to repeat it, and when he did so, promptly knocked him down. A well-known college athlete at the close of his last football season was given a dinner by his friends. In the course of the dinner one of the men told a vile story, and the guest of honor without a word walked out of the room. These boys valued their own self-respect more highly than any temporary consideration of popularity. No one with the manly courage required to administer such a rebuke as this need fear being called a "goody-goody" or a prig. There are persons to whom an acquaintance would never think of telling a vulgar story. This is the highest possible tribute to a man's character. Do your friends tell vulgar stories to you?

The devout psalmist offered this prayer: "Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Study XI. The Problem of Sex

The period of adolescence is marked by the development of the organs of sex. At this period the boy grows rapidly, his voice becomes deeper, his beard begins to grow. He is thus taking on the physical characteristics of a man. These physical changes are accompanied by corresponding changes in his inner life. His mind dwells strangely upon thoughts of the opposite sex. He begins to chafe at the restraints placed upon him at home or in school. He is shaken by forces the source and nature of which he does not understand. It is not necessary nor desirable that a boy should think much upon those changes taking place in him. It is not desirable that he should worry about them at all. They are simply Nature's way of turning a boy into a man. It is, however, important that he should early know the truth about certain things concerning which he is naturally inquisitive and about which he is almost certain otherwise to receive false or misleading information. Ignorance here, as perhaps nowhere else, breeds disaster.

The organs of sex are provided for the purpose of reproduction. In the study of botany or zoölogy you may have become familiar with this wonderful process, by which from the union of male and female cells plants and animals reproduce their kind. This is, perhaps, the most wonderful of all the processes of nature. It is, however, a subject about which boys hear little except in the form of vulgar jest. Do fathers

generally talk frankly with their sons about this? Where did you get your knowledge of the subject? Do you know words which are not vulgar in which you can talk of the organs of sex and the facts of reproduction? Do you think that sex hygiene should be taught in the schools? If not, why, and where should it be taught?

The desire for reproduction is one of the strongest forces in our lives. Man alone of all the animals has polluted this natural instinct. This is due in some degree to the delay which our social customs have placed in the way of marriage. The power and desire of reproduction come long before the boy has completed his education and is ready to assume the responsibilities of married life. There are other reasons which cause late marriages or even prevent marriage at all. Discuss some of these. Anything which discourages marriage at a reasonable age or lessens the sense of responsibility which marriage involves tends toward moral deterioration. Discuss the effect of divorce.

From the earliest times of which we know there has been prostitution. Of late there has been much discussion of the social evil, and investigations have been made as to its causes and effects. It is well known that there are thousands of women, mainly young girls, who live in prostitution. These girls are mostly recruited from the ignorant classes and are seldom led into a life of shame by their own deliberate choice, but often by deceit and not infrequently by actual force. Once started upon this life they seldom emerge, but continue to pander to the evil passions of men, cast out by their own sex and despised by the men whose lust they satisfy, until within a few years, usually not more than five or six, they die miserably as a result of the diseases almost certain to be contracted in this sort of life. And their places must be filled by others, and so the ceaseless sacrifice goes on.

A boy of clean mind and manly spirit who knows the truth will not cause a girl to fall nor share in her degradation once she has fallen. To do so is essentially unfair and unsportsmanlike. Seldom does a girl fall who has not yielded to the stronger force or deception of man. What would you do to the boy who had wronged your sister? The double standard of morality required of men and women is also unsportsmanlike. A girl who has fallen becomes an outcast. A man who contributes to her shame is socially acceptable. You would not marry such a girl. Is it fair for a man to demand that his wife be purer than he is?

All boys should expect to become husbands and fathers. Association with loose women is almost certain to bring diseases of the most loathsome sort, sometimes incurable. These may be communicated to one's wife and children. In this way much suffering is caused to those who are innocent of fault. From the manly feeling of chivalry toward women as well as from consideration of fairness toward the pure girl whom he will some day ask to marry him, and the children whom they will rear, a boy should keep himself from sexual contamination.

Many boys who are not tempted to sexual immorality of this sort are yet in danger of yielding through ignorance or the suggestion of vicious companions

to the habit of self-abuse. This, if persisted in, will lead to harmful results. It is an unnatural practice in which no boy of clean mind and self-control will persist. If continued, the practice tends to weaken a boy's will and leads to his moral and physical degeneracy. A good antidote for this is to keep the mind free from evil by filling it with something else of engrossing interest. Avoid any place, picture, or whatever else gives evil suggestion. Above all, have nothing to do with anyone who suggests sexual excess of any sort. I know a boy who promptly knocked down another who made such a suggestion to him.

Because the impulses and desires of our sexual natures are so strong, constant watchfulness and restraint are necessary. The fight for clean living is a hard one, calling for the best there is in any boy. The penalty for defeat is heavy, but the reward of victory is sure and enduring.

Study XII. Alcoholic Liquors and Tobacco

The census reports for 1910 show that $1,800,000 is annually spent for liquor in the United States. This is the same amount that is spent for food and clothing. If you can find the figures, compare this sum with the cost of education, the value of the property of our colleges and universities, the value of church property, or make any other comparison that occurs to you. The average consumption of liquor for every person in the United States is about twenty-three gallons per year.

We should naturally assume that in a country whose people are intelligent, any article of food or drink, consumed in such quantities and at such cost, must be beneficial. What is the fact regarding liquor? Can you think of any beneficial results from its use? How do you account for its extensive use?

The arguments against the use of intoxicating liquors are manifold and convincing. Its effect upon health and length of life may be computed accurately. The statistics of English life insurance companies show that the average death-rate per thousand among total abstainers is 9.14 per cent, among drinkers 26.82 per cent, almost three times as great. That the use of liquor reduces a man's efficiency is evidenced by the fact that the employers of men in industry and commerce discriminate against drinkers in favor of total abstainers. Discuss this with some railroad official, manufacturer, or other employer of labor.

You will frequently hear the claim made that the revenue obtained from licenses adds to the public funds and reduces taxation, or that the liquor business makes business good in other lines. What can be said against these claims? If you can get the statistics for any town which has voted out the saloon, compare the tax rate before and after; also compare the cost of maintaining the police force and jails. Make any other comparisons that seem to bear on the question.

At present there is a nation-wide, even a world-wide, movement against the liquor traffic. Many states and large portions of other states prohibit

the manufacture and sale of liquors. You will hear it said that "prohibition does not prohibit." What other laws do you think of that do not prohibit the crimes against which they aim? What makes it more difficult to prohibit liquor-selling than murder or theft? What do you think of the argument that preventing the sale of liquor is an infraction of a man's "personal liberty"? What limits may society place to the liberty of one of its members?

Topics for further discussion: The saloon and the home; its relation to crime and pauperism; its relation to politics and government.

We have discussed the subject in its general aspects, but like all other moral problems, its final application is a personal one. The drinking habit is easily acquired and, once acquired, is perhaps the most difficult one to break. No one expects to become a drunkard. Have you any reason to think that your will is stronger than that of others? In its beginning, drinking is almost always social. Our American custom of treating is an important factor. Contrast this with the "Dutch treat," and show how our custom leads to harmful results. A group of young men with no serious purpose set out to see the sights. Some one of them takes the lead and the party finds itself in a saloon; a few drinks follow, and on they go to some worse resort. Next morning some of the boys to whom this was the first experience of the sort are overwhelmed with regret. The important question then is, Are they strong enough not to repeat the experience? A boy shrinks from seeming to his companions to be a prig. Should one fear this when it is a question of drinking? Among men there is no need of hesitation to decline a drink. Discuss Secretary of State Bryan's practice of serving no liquor at state dinners in his home. Does the fact that the foreign guests who sit at his table are accustomed to drink at dinner place any obligation upon him to serve wines?

In many cities there are large numbers of young men whose boarding-places or homes are unattractive, to whom the saloon affords an opportunity for brightness and social pleasure. What other places are there to which they might go and find a welcome? Cities are seeing the need of providing at public expense attractive places for healthful recreation for young people. Chicago's system of small recreation parks providing attractive places for reading, dancing, athletic games, swimming, and other forms of recreation is providing for an important need which is being felt and similarly provided for in other cities. What might be done to meet this need in our school buildings and churches?

Little need be said regarding the use of tobacco. The amount of money spent annually for tobacco, though less than that for liquor, is enormous. Look up the figures. That the use of tobacco is harmful in youth is a well-known fact; that it is also injurious to many mature men is also certain; probably it cannot be shown to benefit anyone who uses it. However, the habit is very common, even among very estimable men.

Smoking is an acquired habit against which the body usually rebels at first. How do you account for its prevalence among boys? When training for the

team or for the track boys know that their physical fitness will be greater without tobacco. Why do they not give it up completely?

The use of tobacco is a selfish habit. A man often smokes in the presence of those to whom it is objectionable. Discuss the rights of the motorman on the streetcar to pure air during his working day, or of the stenographer in the office of her employer. Give some other illustrations of the selfishness of the smoker.

It is also, like drinking, an expensive habit for which many men spend money which is needed for the comfort of those dependent upon them. Compute the cost for a period of years of the cigars of a moderate smoker, reckoning interest at the current rate.

What other arguments can you make against the use of tobacco?

What good reason can you give to justify the use of tobacco for anyone? You doubtless know some men, whose opinions you respect, who use tobacco. Ask them to give you some good reason why they smoke. If they undertake this, see if their reasons are valid. A good rule for a boy in this matter is, wait until you are fully developed physically, say, twenty-one years, before using tobacco. Then do not take it up unless you can find some reason that will satisfy a self-respecting man, even though your father and minister may be addicted to the habit.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. III

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH.D.
Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago

After all possible emphasis has been put upon religious education in the home and the school, it will remain that the institution which must make this subject its supreme interest is the church. We shall therefore need a growing literature, scientifically prepared, upon principles and methods for the educational work of the church. The number of books of the first rank in this field is not yet very large, but there are a dozen or so that every minister should know. We select for special study:

Burton and Mathews, *Principles and Ideals in the Sunday School.*
Cope, *Efficiency in the Sunday School.*
Cope, *The Efficient Layman.*
Haslett, *The Pedagogical Bible School.*

The first of these books was an outgrowth of the experience of the Hyde Park Baptist Sunday School of Chicago, of which the late President Harper was the superintendent. He was a pioneer in the organization of the religious mass-meeting, which had been known as a Sunday school, upon the lines of a pedagogical institution. Professor E. D. Burton was the director of religious education in this school and Professor Mathews one of the teachers. The book, *Principles and Ideals in the Sunday School*, represents the experience up to the year 1903. The authors would be the first to insist that account must be taken of developments in religious pedagogy since that time, to which we may call special attention. The work is in two parts, the first dealing with the teacher, the second with the school. The Bible, as the subject-matter of the teaching, is very definitely in mind in this treatment. The preparation of the teacher, the methods of biblical interpretation, the pedagogical procedure, the moral and spiritual results to be sought are the subjects here dealt with. It is expected that there shall be a very definite intellectual content in the work of the pupils. At the same time the goal ever kept in view is the attainment of a clear personal religious faith. An excellent chapter on the pastor as the teacher of teachers indicates his responsibility in view of the new appreciation of the Bible.

The second part deals with Sunday-school organization. The theory of a completely graded school is carried out. And, notwithstanding the advance in this direction that has been made in the last twenty years, this discussion of

grading is still very timely. Those who have not yet got away from the old idea of the Sunday-school superintendent as a platform leader of a mass of people from infants to adults should consider carefully the duties of the various departmental officers here suggested.

It is likely that the ideal curriculum will not be as exclusively biblical as this plan of ten years ago contemplated. And later experience would change the three years of study in the books of the Bible to studies more definitely biographical. The question of examinations is bound up with the larger question: How far can our Sunday-school work be of a severe intellectual nature? It is proving exceedingly difficult to secure this from older students. The North Dakota plan of high-school credit would of course put the matter on a different basis.

The chapter on "The Function of a Sunday-School Ritual" deals with a most important subject. The ordinary "opening and closing exercises" have little of the worshipful character. But there is great opportunity here for education in religious feeling.

The most recent work upon our problem by an expert is Cope's *Efficiency in the Sunday School*. The author is the general secretary of the Religious Education Association and therefore has the opportunity of first-hand knowledge of a great range of religious educational problems. He believes strongly that the church is a teaching institution and that it should take the matter of training its teachers very seriously. The problem of grading is here discussed with some very much-needed warnings. Indeed, wherever an attempt has been made to improve the educational work of the church there has been the danger of allowing some intellectual aim to become dominant. Of course intellectual achievement is not religious efficiency.

Dr. Cope makes his efficiency tests very clear. He deals with building and equipment, where very much remains to be done; with results in life, where clear understanding is most necessary; with order and discipline, where some very fine educational values are possible; with efficiency in the critical years, analyzing the problem which so often baffles Sunday schools.

This book is not a list of ready-made devices, but it does present in a most practical way methods for improving our work. The discussions on music, boys' activities, rural and city schools, and teacher preparation will be found full of suggestion.

The religious education of the adult is a matter that has received all too little consideration. And yet a church is largely a school for adults. Indeed it is the only formal school that the majority of our people ever get beyond the grammar school. We have been so much concerned with securing the performance of the necessary church work, that we have not realized enough that the activities in which church members engage constitute a most valuable practical education for them. This needs to be scientifically evaluated if the best results are to be obtained. Moreover the instruction given to adults has not generally been carefully planned to suit their needs. There ought to be a definite progress from the young people's classes to those of adults. The books already discussed have dealt with adult

classes, but the whole problem of adult education as applied to men is the subject of Cope's *The Efficient Layman.* A study is made in that book of the various men's clubs, leagues, brotherhoods, organized classes throughout the country, and of their various activities. It is a comment on the difficulty of the endeavor to secure the special interest of men in the church that a number of the organizations discussed in this book are already moribund. The life of a new male movement for the resuscitation of the church is generally from two to five years. And yet some of the methods here discussed have proved their permanent value and have survived the mortality of infant schemes.

It may be questioned whether all writers on men and boys do not exaggerate the differences between the sexes in religious matters. The vigorous girl or the effective woman of today would scarcely recognize her own religious experience in the passive, subjective, feminine type, which is so often presented as unattractive to the masculine nature. Probably all of us, women as well as men, believe in a religion of action, of effectiveness against misery and evil, and of fellowship with God in positive goodness.

The principles of adult training and development in religious service laid down in *The Efficient Layman* can be applied to the whole work of the church. We do not so much need subsidiary organizations as competent leaders in the various branches of church endeavor.

The Pedagogical Bible School by Haslett is an elaborate discussion of a curriculum of religious education on the basis of a presentation of the results of genetic psychology. The author is of the school of Dr. G. Stanley Hall, whose positions in his large work on *Adolescence* are well represented here. The theory of race recapitulation needs to be accepted with great care, but the general characterizations of childhood and youth are very suggestive.

Part I gives in outline the history of religious education. Great changes have taken place in the International Sunday-School organization in the last ten years, and the reader who has not kept himself informed of these advances would do well to see how largely Dr. Haslett's criticisms are happily out of date.

The subject of genetic psychology is of greatest importance for our problem. Haslett in Part II has treated it in a popular and interesting manner, which affords a good introduction to an understanding of the stages of development of childhood and youth. He has included a genetic study of the psychology of religion, indicating the moral and religious manifestations at the various periods of life. His treatment of the emotional instability of adolescence is especially full.

The principal portion of the book, Part III, is the discussion of the curriculum, one of the most complete that has been made. It is of especial value because he has discussed all available material, not limiting himself to the Bible. His treatment of stories, of the miraculous, of pictures, poetry, nature material is excellent. And every minister who tries to preach children's sermons should take warning from the section on "Object Teaching."

After treating the general principles of the curriculum, Haslett gives a

detailed course of studies for seven periods of life. It is so full as to include practically everything available in religious material. It might be possible to disagree with incidental points, but in the main all scientific opinion would indorse the presentation here made.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. May the Sunday school use extra-biblical material? If so, to what extent?

2. What is the specific responsibility of the pastor for an efficient Sunday school?

3. Can the entire educational work of the church be organically related in one comprehensive scheme?

4. What is the difference between masculine and feminine religion?

5. Can we train the lay administrative officers of a church?

6. What Sunday-school textbooks have proved satisfactory?

7. Should we build an auditorium and use it for an educational institution?

SOME FURTHER WORKS

Pease, *An Outline of a Bible-School Curriculum.*
Alexander, *The Sunday School and the Teens.*
Cope, *The Modern Sunday School in Principle and Practice.*
Littlefield, *Handwork in the Sunday School.*
Crooker, *The Church of Today.*
Barbour, *Making Religion Efficient.*
Cressey, *The Church and the Young Man.*
Raymont, *The Use of the Bible in the Education of the Young.*
Hartshorne, *Worship in the Sunday School.*

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS[1]

For several reasons the work of the present month is of very great value to the students of this course, and especially to those who are studying in groups. Because of the fact that the story reverts, in this second book written by Luke, to Paul with whose life the class became familiar in the first three months of the course, the present chapter presents an opportunity for a thorough review and a rapid survey of the life of Paul, without the hampering necessity of the consideration of the letters which he wrote.

More than this, however, the Book of Acts, which contains the material for our present study, presents to the class for the first time a full picture of the pre-Pauline work of the early church. Centering at first around the enthusiastic preaching of Peter and the Jerusalem apostles, Luke carries us in his fascinating narrative through all of the period of the missionary activities of the church, the great problems arising out of the conversion of the gentiles, and the endeavors of the Christians to interpret their new experiences in the light of their early training as well as upon the basis of the principles set forth by Jesus. Through this book we come into close contact with the bitter division of the Jewish society into Christian and non-Christian groups, and the persecutions which arose out of this division.

[1]The suggestions relate to the eighth month's work, the student's material for which appears in the *Biblical World* for April and may be obtained in pamphlet reprints for use with classes. Address: THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE, The University of Chicago.

Perhaps for the first time the members of the class will also appreciate the fact that for centuries the Christian church has devoted large attention to the effort to discover the details of the early life of the Christians, and to mold their own organization and doctrines accordingly. This process has resulted in denominations too numerous to mention, each priding itself on the scriptural correctness of its views. Only in recent years has the emphasis upon these details been shifted to a reconsideration and reinterpretation of the principles and life of Jesus. To this new movement toward finding the vital elements in Christianity is largely due the social and religious awakening of the present day, and the tendency toward union of effort in Christian service, regardless of denominational lines.

Program I

Leader: A careful reading with the class of the outline of the Book of Acts given in the study for the month as a basis for recalling the incidents connected with Paul's labors, and the spirit, atmosphere, and problems of the journeys of Paul.

Members: (1) The story of Pentecost and what it signifies concerning the new religion; (2) the social organization of the early church; (3) the leaders, methods, victims, and larger results of the organized persecution of the Christians; (4) a brief biography of Peter; (5) themes chiefly emphasized by the early evangelist.

Subject for discussion: Of what importance is it that the church of today should be organized and conducted upon the same basis and by the same methods as that of the Apostles?

Program II

Leader: A geographical survey of the early church in its relation to the world of its day.

Members: (1) The diary of Luke; (2) the missionary enterprises of the early church; (3) the story of Paul's arrest and various trials from the point of view of the non-Christian Jews, and the Romans; (4) traces of Luke's admiration for Paul in his story of the arrest, trial, and journey to Rome; (5) steps in the growth of the belief of the early church in the universal gospel.

Subject for discussion: (1) How much is our conception of Paul due to the character of his biographer, or (2) is the church of today comparable in missionary enthusiasm with that of Paul's day? If not, why not?

REFERENCE READING

Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 282–314; Julicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 430–56; Peake, *Introduction to the New Testament*, chap. xiii; Milligan, *Documents of the New Testament*, pp. 161–67; Burton, *Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age*, entire volume; Wrede, *The Origin of the New Testament*, pp. 91–102; Moore, *The New Testament in the Christian Church*, pp. 225–61; von Soden, *History of Early Christian Literature*, pp. 210–48; Bacon, *The Making of the New Testament*, chaps. iii and iv; Gilbert, *Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 4, 5, and extracts from each chapter; Scott, *The Apologetic of the New Testament*, chaps. iii, iv, and vii; Harnack, *Luke, the Physician*, entire volume; *Acts of the Apostles*, entire volume; McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, chap. ii and selections from chaps. iii and iv; Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 315–54; Mathews, *New Testament Times in Palestine*, chaps. xiv and xv; Volume on Acts in each of the following series: *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; The Bible for Home and School; The Century Bible.* Articles too numerous to mention by title will be found in the *Hastings Dictionary of the Bible*, four-volume and one-volume editions, in the *Standard Dictionary of the Bible*, and in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.*

CURRENT OPINION

More Uniformity in Worship

Mr. W. H. Erb writes on "Uniformity in Public Worship" in the *Reformed Church Review* for January, 1914. Prescribed forms of worship were in general use in the third century. The church of the fifth century, which was really one and therefore truly catholic, used in divers countries liturgies which were strikingly similar, and this manifestation of the unity of the church impressed favorably the pagan world. In our times and in this country there is a distinct evolution in the matter of public worship. Some things have come to be accepted as a matter of course; there is less rant and confusion, there is just as much sincerity and spirituality. Speaking for his own denomination, Mr. Erb would like some specific form of service embodying the spirit of the church, showing her peculiar mission. The prayerbook of the Episcopal church has done more to make that denomination distinct than her doctrines, which certainly admit of variety.

A Modernist's View of Authority in Religion

Miss M. D. Petre publishes in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1914, her address to the International Congress of Religious Progress, held in Paris last year, under the title "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Authority in Religion." It is not easy to define Modernism. This very able piece of work, called the encyclic *Pascendi*, has given us a *credo* of Modernism, and upon this basis the *Curia romana* has gone to work. And some say that now, as a result of this activity, Modernism is dead. It is true that reaction triumphs now in the Roman church and that many a Modernist has ceased to hope for victory, but Modernism can no more perish than the air which we breathe: the church herself cannot live without it for any length of time. Modernism is the right conception of liberty *and* authority, adjusting their rival claims, utilizing both principles in the building-up of religion and the church. Religion cannot be understood without an institution, the church. No institution can exist without a principle of authority. It is true that most men care for comfort and ease more than for freedom, and in the majority of cases they get more of that comfort if they live in subjection than when they are entirely free. Again there is an obedience inspired by love of the ideal, be it the service of the country, or of a great man like Napoleon, or of a religious leader. Therefore, no criticism of authority will be useful for practical purposes if it fails to take account of this double tendency to obey, the one springing from the natural sloth of many characters, the other from an ideal of self-sacrifice. It seems a truism that the right conception of authority will be such as to compel no man to obey without his full consent. External obedience is only an apparent triumph of authority; no obedience is perfect which does not comprise that of the will and of the intelligence. The soldier is asked to pay only outward respect, but in religious matters nothing short of a tribute of the entire man, soul and body, can be demanded. And for this reason it is evident that the law must cease to bind when the reason, the self-governing faculty, can go no farther.

It is certain that the Roman hierarchy and other seats of authority in matters of faith would object very much to this treatment of their prerogatives. We seem to hear in this view of Miss Petre an echo or a restatement of Calvin's theory of "the Mastery of the Spirit" (*la maîtrise de l'esprit*).

In the conclusion of her paper Miss Petre

shows that the advantages of authority are that it guides those who cannot guide themselves and stands for the high principle of love and union by the subjection of the private to the Universal Will. Its disadvantages are that being centered in limited beings it can wander. Yes, and we may add here, the excommunication of men like Tyrrell and more recently of Lemire shows how authority can be oppressive and become retrograde.

The Old Testament a Modern Message

Much has been written on this subject, but we can never say too often that constructive criticism has given to the church a living Old Testament, throbbing with actuality. Dr. MacFadyen writes on this theme of "The Old Testament and the Modern World" in the *Expositor* for January, 1914. It is certain that God spoke to the Fathers by the prophets; the question now is, Does he speak to *us* through them? The world seems to change in a terrific evolution, but the problems and sorrows of life are ever the same. The Old Testament is intensely human; it is a book of hope, but hope in this world and for this world; it teaches us how to interpret the great currents of life, of these mysterious forces of history through which suffering humanity is to be redeemed. The Hebrew seers did not dogmatize about metaphysical niceties; life was too real for them; they believed in a God who was molding nature and society and gave life because he was life. They saw God in the joys of a wedding and of a vintage festival, they heard his voice in the thundering clash of war, they divined him beyond the mysteries of birth, death, and sorrow. While the Old Testament has its roots in those enduring realities, it speaks to us men of the twentieth century with an accent that is peculiarly modern in its treatment of the problems of the individual, of society, and of the world at large. The great problem of justice was just as acute for the Hebrew believers as for us; they solved it in a practical way, binding together by an indissoluble link the service of God and the service of man, inspiring ethics with a sublime faith, pure and adamant-like: God's cause *will* triumph in a future which is the issue of the present.

Japan and Christianity

The Churchman for January, 1914, devotes a page to an article by a member of the Japanese Imperial Diet, Dr. Uzawa, M.P., in answer to the question "Does Japan Need Christianity?" It is a clear, affirmative answer. His position rests upon the assumption that religion in some form is essential to man's wholesome existence as well as to human progress. The question, then, is not, Does Japan need a religion? but, What religion does Japan need? "We in the East," he goes on to say, "have been a civilized people for some three thousand years, but our religion in that time did not do as much for us as Christianity did for Europe and the West in half that time. No religion exists which does not contain some light, however crude the religion; but only from Christian sources comes the pure, white light of lucid personality and transparent character. Christianity is the white corpuscle to protect the soul's blood, and consequently the whole man, from evil spiritual influences. Our country," he adds, "is very successful at producing criminals and incorrigible youth; why not now welcome an influence that will make men? When I say what this religion can do for a man, I speak out of the seriousness and fulness of my own experience. Both in my experience as a lawyer and as a member of the Imperial Diet I have been confirmed in my conviction that no nation can successfully entertain world-wide hopes and ambitions without the help of a universal religion, nor can she make a universal appeal without the inspiration of the Christian

religion." Referring to the California situation and the recent Korean conspiracy trial, he very graciously suggests that possibly both sides need more Christianity.

The Meaning of Tradition

Professor W. R. Arnold writes in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January, 1914, on "Theology and Tradition." There is, in academic circles, a widespread conviction that theology is not and can never be scientific, mainly because theology is tradition. This however is not exact; religion is necessarily traditional; its domain is not science but concrete life and experience; theology is not religion but the interpretation of it. Just like other sciences, a free theology will look facts squarely in the face; it will not content itself with repeating ancient and perhaps dead formulas, but, considering the evolution of humanity and the enlargement of our horizon, theology will adjust itself to new conditions. There is nothing to be afraid or ashamed of in the word "tradition." The faculty of language, for instance, is a tradition: it is an organism carried by the living spirit of the race, constantly changing on its fringes while it remains a syntactical whole. Such is living tradition; such is Christianity. Our religion is an inheritance, not because we have received it in purely passive fashion as into a receptacle, but because we make it ours. Theology will humanize the records of our faith, so that we may truly assimilate them and grow into a better knowledge of the life that was in the prophets, the apostles, and the saints.

The Religious Crisis in Portugal

The January number of *Études* contains an article by Camille Torrend on "La crise religieuse en Portugal." The leaders of the young Lusitanian republic found out very soon that the Roman Catholic hierarchy was hostile to the new régime. They had fully expected it. In 1911 the law of separation between church and state was promulgated. It was not intended to give freedom to the church, but to weaken her power. It was still less liberal than the French law of separation. Rome took up the same antagonistic position and refused to acknowledge the law. Now the church is in a precarious condition, and although persecution has abated, there is still a good deal of hostility against the clergy. Priests are not allowed to wear a cassock outside of a church. Some zealous "anticlericals" have even prescribed that the length of their frock coats must not be longer than the coats usually worn in the country. A preacher who happened to say in his sermon that "the Providence governs us" was interrupted by the mayor, who cried out, "No, Affonso Costa [the President] only governs us." A very large number of churches have been closed.

The immediate result has been the weakening of the liberal-minded clergy of the church in Portugal. M. Torrend, voicing the opinion of the Jesuits, sees in an absolute obedience and conformity to the spirit of Rome and the forsaking of lingering Jansenist ideas the only hope of saving the Lusitanian church and redeeming Portugal.

Early Babylonian Laws

In the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* for January, 1914, A. T. Clay writes on "A Sumerian Prototype of the Hammurabi Code." He publishes a Sumerian tablet from the Yale collection where we find two laws bearing upon the injury done to pregnant women and one making provision if a lion kills a hired ox, which are strikingly parallel to the Hammurabi Code. That the code, as we have it, is based on older Sumerian laws can now be looked upon as established. In the light of such facts the assertion of Hammurabi that he received the Code from the god Shamash himself is very interesting as a sample of oriental accuracy.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

Co-operation in China

In China—and elsewhere—the free-lance missionary and the independent small mission have often proved a hindrance rather than a help, first because the Chinese failed to understand the purpose of such a mission, and also because its views were, as a matter of course, peculiar. So confederation of churches belonging to the same body and co-operation of these churches on the base of interdenominationalism will give a real impetus to mission work. It is hoped that before long a scheme for a union Christian University in Peking will be a tangible result of the new spirit of co-operation.

The Kikuyu Conference

A conference of representatives of missionary societies working in British East Africa was held at Kikuyu in June. This gathering drew up a scheme of federation of Protestant missions. Two bishops of the Anglican church entered heartily into the agreement. It was decided that each mission would accept as communicants members of other churches who would come and live in the vicinity, if these members brought a ticket or letter of transfer. Preachers belonging to any denomination would be allowed to preach in other churches. A simplified form of liturgical service would be composed and this form would be used at stated times in the divers churches, so that Christians belonging to every denomination may get accustomed to it. When the Bishop of Zanzibar, part of whose diocese is in British East Africa, and whose views are of the type usually called "high church," heard of the results of the Conference, he protested against the federation scheme and accused his two colleagues of heresy. It is much to be regretted that the Bishop of Zanzibar failed to attend the Conference. His presence would have been a safeguard against hasty decisions and the historic position of the Church of England would probably not have been abandoned, as it seems to have been, by the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa. From the point of view of strict legality, the Bishop of Zanzibar may be right, but there are duties which transcend legality and Christian union is one of these. The agitation created in England over this affair has abated. It seems probable that the scheme of Kikuyu will be dropped or at least made less complete. It would probably have been a better scheme if it had been less drastic.

Mass Movements in the Dutch East Indies

The mass movement toward Christianity among the animistic tribes in the Dutch East Indies spreads rapidly. The German Rhenish mission among the Bataks in Sumatra reports 14,000 baptisms, bringing the total Christian community among the people to 140,000. There is also a very large increase of church membership among the Borneo Dayaks. The peril of the future seems to be the influence of a materialistic European civilization. Javanese of the upper class will be tempted to adopt only certain features of western culture—and these not always the best—without acquiring a real knowledge of its higher principles.

The Lokoja Conference

A United Missionary Conference was held at Lokoja, in July. Various missionary societies working in Northern Nigeria were represented. No ecclesiastical discussion took place: some common points were agreed to concerning the policy to be

followed in respect to certain native customs. It was decided, for instance, that the native form of marriage was not to be regarded as being a marriage at all, because it is not binding for life. Mohammedan missionaries do not usually attack native customs so sharply. Perhaps they are wiser. The British government puts restrictions on mission work among Mohammedans in Northern Nigeria. Early in 1913, an agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society was expelled from Northern Nigeria by the British authorities.

Mission Work in Japan

There are in Japan 92,595 non-Roman Christians and 63,081 Roman Catholics. There are 80 Protestant houses of worship in Tokyo and their total church attendance on Sunday morning is 5,000 on the average.

American Missionary Budget for 1913

Nearly sixteen and one-half million dollars were given last year for Foreign Missions by the Protestant churches of the United States and of Canada. Advance toward self-support is shown by the fact that nearly four million dollars were contributed by the native churches on the foreign field under American supervision. There were last year 6,979 American missionaries in foreign countries, in addition to 2,807 wives of missionaries. Native workers numbered 48,454 and the full communicant members of the native churches belonging to American missions are 1,366,551, a remarkable increase of 200,000 over last year. During the same period $400,000,000 were spent on local American churches.

Mission Work of the American Catholic Church in Cuba

The ancient colonies of Spain are just as much in need of missionaries as the heathen world. The Roman Catholic church has lost her hold upon the people, and millions are now shepherdless in these nominally Christian countries. The Protestant Episcopal church in Cuba has increased in 9 years from 200 to 1,700 communicants and from 2 clergymen to 24. Half of these communicants are English-speaking people. The Spanish-speaking members of the church are usually of the lower class, as in most foreign fields.

What the Chinese Think of Mission Work

During the Boxer rebellion, many missionaries were massacred in Shansi, China, Now the government of this province has asked the American Board of Foreign Missions to take charge of a very large number of the public schools of Shansi, with liberty to teach the Bible and the Christian religion. A large grant is also promised by the government. It is doubtful whether the American Board will accept this offer because of the heavy expenditure already incurred by the Society.

The Outcome of the Conspiracy Trials in Korea

The high-handed treatment of Christian Nationalists in Korea by the Japanese has brought about a decrease in the number of catechumens. The Presbyterian and Methodist missions work in good harmony and have formed together a Federal Council. These missions report 11,700 baptisms during the last year. The circulation of Scriptures has been a record one.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Religious Education Association

The annual convention of this association is always a gathering of significance in the religious world. The twelfth convention, which met at New Haven, March 4–7, was not a meeting of the association as a whole, but of the council which is charged with the study of special topics. Consideration this year was given to the subject "Higher Education and the Social Order." The concentration of interest thus secured gave weight to the discussions. The moral and religious quality of the college life as of fundamental importance was discussed by presidents, deans, instructors, Christian Association officers, and others. Among the problems considered were the moral values of the curriculum, student honor, athletics, fraternity life, altruistic activities. As indicating the breadth of the interest it was noteworthy that conditions in the colleges of the non-Christian world were given consideration side by side with our own. In addition to the professional workers in religious education, the convention was made noteworthy by the presence of Mr. Whitman, ex-President Taft, Dr. Mott, besides President Hadley of Yale University. The convention elected President George E. Vincent of Minnesota as its presiding officer for the coming year and appointed Buffalo as the next place of meeting.

Hymns in Religious Education

The importance of hymns as material for religious education has been receiving very little consideration in the present-day publications on Sunday-school work and efficiency. In Rev. Bernard Feeney's *The Catholic Sunday School* hymns are shown to be an integral part of the Sunday-school curriculum of that communion. In the different grades the Catholic children are taught to memorize hymns appropriate to their years. They memorize them and are taught to understand their meaning before they learn to sing them. The "Constructive Studies" include books of this character for an awakening consciousness of need for hymns that will more adequately express as well as deepen the fundamental religious emotions. A hymnbook of from fifty to one hundred hymns in our Sunday schools, every one worthy of memorizing and set to appropriate music, is evidently the desirable thing.

Significant in this connection as relating to the social side of religion is a list of one hundred and ten hymns published in *The Survey* of January 3, 1914. They are presented under the title "One Hundred Hymns of Brotherhood and Social Aspiration." The words of the hymns are printed and the tunes to which the hymns have been set are indicated. In a few instances the music is shown. This list is a result of invitations sent out by *The Survey* to contributors asking for favorite hymns or hymns of their own composing that might be classed as social. The response was so generous that the task of selection became enormous. This work was intrusted to a temporary Editor-of-hymns with twelve helpers, or "eminent jurors," as the report says.

The hymns are classified as follows: I, Aspiration and Faith, 35 hymns; II, Liberty and Justice, 16; III, Peace, 6; IV, Labor and Conflict, 19; V, Brotherhood, 18; VI, Patriotism, 16. Of the 110 hymns 11 were written in 1913 according to the date they bear, and twenty-one others within the last decade. Still others, while bearing no date, are the production of present-day writers. In the editor's acknowledgments to authors, composers, and publishers of social hymns (p. 421) reference is made to the space given to this class of hymns in the hymnbooks published last year.

In *The Hymnal of Praise*, 20 per cent are social hymns; in *Songs of Worship and Service*, 18 per cent; in *The Pilgrim Hymnal*, 14 per cent; in *The American Hymnal*, 12 per cent; in *Service Songs* (Christian Endeavor), 7 per cent; in *Songs of the Christian Life*, 6 per cent.

Special commendation is given to *The Hymnal of Praise* (A. S. Barnes & Co.). It is spoken of as "a collection particularly suited for young people. It builds up the theme of the Christian kingdom—from the home, through the school and church, to the city, the nation, and the world—with International Brotherhood and Peace."

Religious Instruction in Germany

In the *Methodist Review* for January, 1914, appears an article by Professor W. K. Matthews, of the Kwansei Gakuin, Kobe, Japan, on the subject, "Some Features of Higher Education in Germany." The article is a report of an investigation made chiefly in and around Berlin, more especially of the work of the higher schools. Speaking of the German school system in general, the writer says: "It has been worked out with German thoroughness by the best minds of the nation, and is as complete, and as nicely adjusted as the mechanism of a clock." Constant, close, and impartial government supervision insures its effectiveness.

Instruction in religion is as thorough as in other subjects. Examinations are as carefully given, and the grades are counted in deciding the pupil's standing. For three years before entering the higher schools the pupils have had in the primary school from two to four hours a week of religious instruction consisting chiefly of Bible stories. Three hours a week for the first year in the higher schools and two hours a week for eight succeeding years are devoted to distinctively religious education.

The course is comprehensive, progressive, well articulated, and at each stage well adapted to the development of the pupil's mind. While the course (as given in Protestant schools) is clearly made for the purpose of teaching the Prussian state religion, yet it has features "well worth our study when planning our course of instruction in religion," according to Mr. Matthews' judgment. A detailed statement of this course is given in James E. Russell's work on *German Higher Schools*, new edition, 1907, published by Longmans, Green & Co., New York.

Mr. Matthews spent considerable time in visiting schools and class exercises. His observations were that the interest of the students and the success of the teaching seemed to vary greatly. The work in the higher classes seemed generally to be well done, and yet it was evident that the pupils did not enjoy the study. The teachers who make this their chief subject usually teach one or two other subjects. They have the same rank and draw the same salary as the other teachers in the school, and are appointed in the same way. The writer speaks of being impressed with the superior scholarship and attractive personality of these men, as well as with the seriousness and thoroughness of their work. Yet notwithstanding all this, the results are generally declared to be far from satisfactory. A large majority of the boys leave the schools at the end having little interest in religion and none in the church. They have much scholastic knowledge but no religious life.

Why then does not so much and so thorough religious instruction make religious citizens? Five reasons are set forth. The essence of these reasons is that the failure seems to be due to a lack of vital personal religion. Germany, in its religious education, is holding to outworn forms which have long since lost the spirit. One scarcely needs a better illustration of the inadequacy of mere systems or methods of religious education, however excellently organized.

The Bane of Bad Hymns

In a penetrative article on "Theology of Hymns," Edward S. Worcester of Norwich, Conn., has this to say in the *Hartford Seminary Record:* "It is a reflection upon the otherwise good judgment of some missionary bodies that they have not infrequently chosen our feebler efforts [in hymn-writing] for translation into foreign tongues. It is a reflection upon the discernment which should accompany zeal that we at home so readily surrender our people's prayers and praise to the random and ephemeral jingles of the professional revivalist. . . . . There are compositions in vogue in certain quarters which musically are beneath the level of the street piano and poetically are not good enough to commit to memory in a district school. . . . . Men will yet summon a congregation to worship in rhymes which are false in sentiment, cheap in expression, and half-baked in theology, if only they will assume the name of 'gospel' songs. If ever a body of literature needed to be looked into with discrimination before use, it is that which is turned out with increasing fluency these days by men whose acquaintance with accurate religious thought is almost nil and whose chief inspiration would seem to be commercial."

CHURCH EFFICIENCY

The Problem of the Prayer Meeting

One of the most aggressive churches in the East—the Lake Avenue Baptist of Rochester, N.Y.—has recently inaugurated a scheme for the solution of the insistent prayer-meeting problem which would seem feasible for many other perplexed churches. At Lake Avenue they have this fall instituted the "Big Wednesday Evening," which has proved very successful both in point of numbers and in interest. The activities of the church are concentrated upon this one week-day evening to prevent loss through too great scattering of meetings throughout the week. Once a month the ladies have their meeting at 2:30 in the afternoon but the rest of the features of the "Big Wednesday Evening" occur every week. The hour from five to six is reserved for various committee meetings and at 6:20 the ladies of the church serve a supper at a very nominal cost to everyone who can attend. This supper is made the occasion of much informality and fun, everyone wearing a tag on which is his or her name and joining in the informal "sing" with which the meal closes under the able assistance of a voluntary orchestra of young people. At 7 there are various study groups on missionary topics under competent leadership, or, as in the case of the first three weeks of the fall, an entertainment illustrating some theme of missionary significance, such as the incoming immigrants at Ellis Island. Sometimes some prominent missionary speaker is secured for this period. At 8:15 occurs the regular church prayer meeting, at which the orchestra is again in evidence, assisted by a young people's choir. The hour from 9 to 10 is again reserved for committee sessions of various kinds. Among the most successful of the mission-study groups were courses upon the Appeal of the Missionary Task, The Emergency in China, The Church and the City Problem, Mormonism, Islam of America, The Business Side of the Missionary Task, Missionary Biography, Contemporary Missionary Leaders, Medical Missions, The Bible and Missions, Comparative Religions, and others.

This church is supporting three missionary families in the foreign field besides workers in the home field. Much intelligent interest in the undertaking is largely generated at these "Big Wednesday Evenings."

BOOK NOTICES

A Source Book for Ancient Church History. By Joseph Cullen Ayer, Jr. New York: Scribner, 1913. Pp. xxi+707. $4.50.

Dr. Ayer is professor of ecclesiastical history in the Philadelphia Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal church. The volume covers the epoch from the Apostolic age to the close of the conciliar period in the eighth century. It is a volume which will be a standard tool for work in the field of ancient and mediaeval history. Present-day tendencies toward the blending of interests and the interpretation of all special problems in terms of a larger outlook give a culture value to sourcebooks which they could not have possessed in the eyes of earlier generations of scholars. Indeed, sourcebooks and broader insights are characteristic of the present age. Dr. Ayer's choice of material, and the comments which he intersperses, make this work highly valuable. The documents reproduced begin with the Apostolic age, and relate to such matters as Judaism and Christianity, the early persecutions and martyrdoms, church organization, heathenism in relation to Christianity, the great gnostic heresy and other heretical movements, the beginnings of Catholic theology, extension of the church, the Council of Nicea and other councils, monasticism, clerical celibacy, Augustinianism, the transition to the Middle Ages, etc. The book will be useful, not only to students of ecclesiastical history, but to students of general history as well.

The Quakers in England and America. By Charles Frederick Holder. Los Angeles: The Neuner Co., 1913. Pp. 669. Double vol. $6.25.

Dr. Holder's large literary experience, and his interest in the subject through his Quaker ancestry, have combined to produce a readable and instructive work. America and England are not so conscious of the debt they owe to the Quakers as they will be in years to come. The present volume should have a place in the awakening of the Anglo-Saxon peoples to the realities of English and American history. As the author says, there is not a great moral reform, from the abolition of capital punishment to the equality of women, or the freedom of slaves to civic righteousness, worked for today by organized forces, that the Quakers had not thought of, and were demanding from the house-tops two hundred and fifty years ago. They fought and died for the simple life, morality, and virtue. Such lives should not be forgotten; they should be known to the people of today, who are enjoying the religious liberty for which the early Quakers fought and died. Dr. Holder carries the reader along over a narrative which is full of detail and color, and which preserves the sense of historical perspective. The book does not pay that formal deference to the "sources" which the rigidly scientific student of history demands, and which is found in such volumes on Quaker history as those of Braithwaite and Jones. The author states explicitly that he is writing a popular history (Preface, pp. 11 and 12); and the book must, of course, be judged with this fact in mind. It begins with a sketch of religious and political conditions in England "previous to the nineteenth century," and then goes on to consider the rise of Quakerism in England, its invasion of America, and its course on both sides of the sea to the present time. The volume is supplied with many well-chosen illustrations. Altogether, it gives a vivid and realistic sense of its interesting theme.

My Father: Reminiscences of W. T. Stead. By Estelle W. Stead. New York: G. H. Doran Co., 1913. Pp. xii+351. $2.50.

This biographical study follows in the wake of the "Titanic" disaster. W. T. Stead was sixty-three years of age at the time he took passage on the ill-fated vessel; and he had a longer normal expectation of life. The book before us is not a systematic "Life"; but it gives all the essential facts in the career of Mr. Stead. His daughter has chosen to dwell especially upon his interest in Spiritualism, and has sought to show, from his own writings, the influence of Spiritualism upon Mr. Stead's career. This aspect of his thought will unfavorably affect the judgment which most people pass upon him. Mr. Stead, however, did quite a number of things in addition to studying and practicing the occult; and although the latter takes what we feel is a disproportionate space in the volume before us, it is by his non-spiritualistic doings that he is best known. His more conventional activities include his work in exposing the white slave traffic in England, his participation in politics, his campaign for international arbitration, and his editorial work on *The Pall Mall Gazette*, *The Review of Reviews*, and other publications. The reminiscences before us give a number of intimate side-lights upon public life, and a good idea of the part played by one who was a vital and enterprising, but hardly a great, figure in the events of his time. The book furnishes good material for study of contemporary history, and should find its way to the attention of a considerable audience.

(1) The Book of Judges in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes and **(2) The Book of Ruth in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes.** By G. A. Cooke. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Pp. xlii+204 and xviii+22. *2s. 6d.*

These two commentaries, bound together in one volume, make a useful addition to the "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges." The introductions gather up and present in clear and interesting form the commonly accepted conclusions of modern scholarship regarding Judges and Ruth. The author parts with the majority of scholars in one main point, viz., in that he refuses to accept Ruth as a book written to enforce a protest against the narrowness and exclusiveness of the days of Nehemiah and Ezra. In the analysis of Judges, he shrinks from identifying himself with the school that finds in Judges the J and E of the Hexateuch. The scholarship of these commentaries is adequate; but the technicalities of scholarship are allowed to disappear. The comments are brief and clarifying and maintain well the standard of the best volumes of the series. No book of the Old Testament conveys so well as Judges an idea of the primitive and crude character of early Hebrew life in Canaan, and Professor Cooke has made good use of his opportunity in this respect.

An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. By Charles A. Beard. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. vii+330. $2.25.

Religious workers have been repelled, with good reason, by the manner in which the "economic interpretation of history" has been presented in the past. Today, however, this view of the progress of civilization is finding a more temperate and scholarly treatment; and it is rapidly becoming familiar to ministers and theologians. The present book is by a well-equipped professor in Columbia University, New York City. It is based upon a great variety of documents and sources, many of which belong to our national and state governments. The data are adequate; and most of the conclusions will be anticipated and accepted by careful readers before coming to those portions of the text in which they are explicitly drawn. Not only is there in the book nothing which will alarm or unsettle the well-grounded modern minister; but the volume is replete with information which the minister ought to possess if he is to have an intelligent background for his thought about national problems.

Professor Beard deals with the fundamental economic conditions involved in the origin and adoption of the Constitution of the United States. He makes a careful survey of American economic interests prior to the establishment of the Constitution, and shows the economic nature of the campaign for a new national government. Taking up, in alphabetical order, the men composing the Philadelphia convention, the author shows in detail what were the economic circumstances and interests of each one. The overwhelming majority of members were immediately, directly, and personally interested in the outcome of their labors at Philadelphia, and were to a greater or less extent economic beneficiaries from the adoption of the Constitution. Most of the members came from towns on or near the coast, that is, from the regions in which personal property was largely concentrated. Not one member represented, in his immediate, personal, economic interests, the small farming or mechanic classes. The treatise then goes on to consider the Constitution itself as an economic document, the process of ratification, etc. The volume is most important and significant, marking, as we believe, a new era in the interpretation of American history.

The Reformation in Germany. By Henry C. Vedder. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. xlix+466. $3.00 net.

A volume on the Reformation would certainly seem to be either daring or unnecessary. If one comes to the subject from the traditional point of view and with little sympathy with modern historical method, there is no place for the new volume. But Professor Vedder has done something more than retell a tale. He has written a work which treats the Reformation as something more than a bit of pictorial biography. In his introduction he describes Germany as it was in the sixteenth century, with particular reference to the economic condition. Out from that economic condition he holds that the Reformation movement in large part sprang. Not that he would reduce the Reformation to an economic struggle merely, but he has no illusions as to the significance of Luther. In fact, the volume subjects the reformer and his movement to severe criticism. More than that Professor Vedder is convinced, as every unbiased historian must be convinced, that the Reformation movement, after its first break with Rome, tended to re-establish a state—instead of an imperial autocracy in religion. His estimate of the Reformation movement is to the effect that it was complex, anything but exclusively religious, however large a rôle religion played within it. But it was not a religion of freedom nor did it aim at the emancipation of religion from the control of the state. It marked the re-establishment of the higher feudal aristocracy and the beginning of capitalism in the triumph of the middle class. The peasants gained nothing from the movement and the knights were ruined. It perverted the Renaissance, enforced the supremacy of the Scriptures in

unworthy and inconsistent ways, resulted in a new scholasticism, and had no immediate ethical force.

This partial summary of his conclusions will show that the book is anything but conventional. If we were asked, however, how far Professor Vedder had actually traced economic forces, we should have to say that the volume appears to have been the re-working from the point of view of the new economic history, of earlier studies which but superficially regarded economic matters. Certainly it is not a thoroughgoing economic interpretation, as indeed it should not be. Yet, although the economic element is not as prominent in the book as its introduction would lead us to expect, it is so far recognized as to give the work a vigor and modernness of treatment which makes it outstanding. If it is not altogether written up from the sources in complete fashion, the book's use of secondary authorities indicates Professor Vedder's acquaintance with the newer type of Reformation studies, and therefore it will give wider currency to the more impartial and scientific estimates of an epoch whose real significance has too often been obscured by dogmatic sympathies and purposes.

Our Neighbors, the Chinese. By Joseph K. Goodrich. Chicago: Browne & Howell Co., 1913. Pp. 279. $1.25.

A very readable sketch of contemporary Chinese society from all angles of approach. It may be used in connection with Dr. Soothill's work, noticed above, as it admirably supplements a volume dealing with China's religion. It gives a view of literature and folk-lore; education; home life; industry; social classes; the provinces; Mongols, Manchus, and Thibetans; child life; travel in China, etc. The book is equipped with sixteen illustrations from photographs, an index, and a good bibliography of English titles. It is well adapted both for general reading and for use in study clubs and mission classes.

Marxism versus Socialism. By Vladimir G. Simkhovitch. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1913. Pp. xvi+298. $1.75.

Everybody who has paid any serious attention to socialism in recent years is more or less aware that the movement has, with comparative suddenness, developed a bifurcation of tendencies which is both startling and mysterious. Some years ago, socialists were quite sure that they had the true scientific keys to the past and the future. Today, they have separated into right and left wings called, respectively, "yellow" and "red." The affiliations of the yellow right are with "social reform" and "political action." Those of the red left are with "revolution," "syndicalism," and "direct action." To the layman, all this is rather confusing; but fundamentally the situation is not so mysterious as it seems. The author of the volume before us is a professor of economic history in Columbia University; and in this book he makes a clear and scholarly statement of the philosophical position of socialism today. While we cannot agree with all the author's positions, which in some cases appear to be unfair to the socialists, we have no hesitation in recommending the book to students of the movement. The author points out that of all the doctrines of Marx, the "economic interpretation of history" has suffered least from the ravages of time and criticism. Only a layman, however, could regard this method as a complete and perfect instrument of social research and interpretation. Professor Simkhovitch argues that nearly all the tendencies upon which Marx counted have failed him, and that, from the standpoint of the economic interpretation of history itself, the revolution whereby capitalism is to be subverted is not the inevitable future of social progress, but a concept in the realm of Utopianism. The book is one which appeals rather to the philosopher than to the general reader; and it ought to have a wide reading among students.

Professor G. A. Johnston Ross, of Union Theological Seminary, is the author of a devotional study of the Apostles' Creed, which is entitled *The God We Trust* (Revell, $1.25). Dr. Ross holds that the present-day reduction of homiletic and theological emphasis to one or two very simple truths and appeals deprives many religious persons of that "plan," or "system," which they crave in their desire to square faith with all the facts of life. To meet this contemporary spiritual hunger, he would employ the Apostles' Creed as a devotional symbol for a systematic faith in which we associate ourselves with the church of the past while holding ourselves free from the tyranny of words and phrases.

A translation of a German work on the Apostles' Creed by Professor Johannes Kunze, of the University of Greifswald, is published as *The Apostles' Creed and the New Testament* (Funk & Wagnalls, $1.25). Instead of deriving the creed from the New Testament, the author takes opposite ground, regarding the creed as anterior to the earliest parts of the New Testament. The book is polemical, and will not find much response in America. It was occasioned by the attempts of liberal German theologians to have the creed omitted from church usage.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. VIII

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

This course is published in ten leaflets issued on the fifteenth of each month from September, 1913, to June, 1914. It is sent free to all members of the AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE *enrolling for this course. Membership in the* INSTITUTE *may be secured by sending the annual membership fee of fifty cents and four cents for postage to the headquarters of the* INSTITUTE, *at the University of Chicago.*

STUDY VII

CHAPTER XII

THE TRIUMPHANT SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY FROM JERUSALEM TO ROME, AS TOLD IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

First day.—§ 75. *The authorship and scope of the Book of Acts.* Scholars are practically unanimous in the judgment that this book (Acts) and the Third Gospel (Luke) were written by the same author, as language, style, and subject-matter abundantly show. Furthermore, Acts, like Luke, contains many common and not a few carefully chosen technical, medical terms, pointing to a Greek physician as the probable author. Early church tradition strongly favors the Lukan authorship of both works. Four passages from a diary kept by one of Paul's co-workers used in Acts (16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1—28:16), combined with certain references in Paul's letters (Col. 4:14*a;* Philem., vs. 24*b;* II Tim. 4:11*a*) suggest that Luke is the probable companion, and the author of both diary and the complete Book of Acts. While this book deals actually with only a few of the apostles and their careers, chiefly that of Paul, it tells practically all that we know of their methods of work, their message, and their indomitable faith, and helps us to picture to ourselves how boldly and successfully they carried on the work left them by their Master, whose spirit indeed continued to work in them mightily. (See outline of Acts which follows.)

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTS

I. The Reassembling and Organization of Jesus' Followers:
   1. The promise of the spirit, and the ascension of Jesus (1:1–14).
   2. The choosing of Matthias (1:15–26).
   3. The coming of the Spirit (2:1–13).

4. Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost (2:14–36).
5. The conversion of the three thousand (2:37–42).
6. The church in peace and favor (2:43–47).

II. The Growth of the Church in Jerusalem:
1. The healing of the lame man by Peter and John (3:1–10).
2. Peter's sermon in Solomon's Porch (3:11–26).
3. The first imprisonment of Peter and John (4:1–31).
4. The unity of the church and the community of goods (4:32–37).
5. Ananias and Sapphira (5:1–11).
6. Signs and wonders done by the apostles (5:12–16).
7. The second imprisonment of the apostles (5:17–42).
8. The appointment of the Seven (6:1–7).
9. The trial and death of Stephen the martyr (6:8—8:1*a*).

III. The Church Scattered by Persecution: The Work Broadened and Deepened:
1. The scattering of the church by persecution (8:1*b*–3[4]).
2. The planting of the church in the city of Samaria (8:4–25).
3. Philip and the Ethiopian treasurer (8:26–40).
4. The conversion of Saul (9:1–19*a* [cf. 22:5–16; 26:12–18]).
5. The three years in Damascus and Arabia (9:19*b*–25 [cf. Gal. 1:17*b* (18*a*)]).
6. Saul in Jerusalem, Syria, and Cilicia (9:26–31 [cf. 22:17–21; Gal. 1:18–24]).
7. The healing of Aeneas (9:32–35).
8. The raising of Dorcas (9:36–43).
9. Peter's visit to Cornelius (chap. 10).
10. Peter's defense of his action respecting Cornelius (11:1–18).
11. The beginning of the gospel in Antioch (11:19–26).
12. Relief sent from Antioch to the brethren in Judea (11:27–30).
13. The persecution of the church by Herod Agrippa I (12:1–24).
14. The return to Antioch of the messengers to Jerusalem (12:25).

IV. Missions to Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece:
1. Barnabas and Saul sent forth from Antioch (13:1–3).
2. Preaching the Word at Salamis and Paphos (13:4–12).
3. At Pisidian Antioch (13:13–52).
4. At Iconium (14:1–7).
5. At Lystra and Derbe, and the return to Antioch in Syria (14:8–28).
6. The council at Jerusalem (15:1–29; Gal. 2:1–10).
7. Report of the council's action to the church at Antioch (15:30–35).
8. Peter's visit to Antioch (Gal. 2:11–21).
9. The dissension between Paul and Barnabas (15:36–41).
10. The churches in southern Asia Minor revisited (16:1–5).
11. The journey to Troas, and the vision of Paul (16:6–10).
12. The beginning of the gospel in Philippi (16:11–40).
13. The planting of the church in Thessalonica (17:1–9; I Thess. 1:1—2:14)
14. Preaching in the synagogue at Berea (17:10–15).
15. Paul at Athens (17:16–34).
16. Paul's first ministry in Corinth (18:1–17).

17. Paul's return to Syria and third sojourn in Antioch (18:18–23*a*).
18. The churches of the Galatian region and Phrygia revisited (18:23*b*).
19. Apollos in Ephesus and Corinth (18:24–28).
20. Paul's ministry in Ephesus (chap. 19 [20:1]).
21. From Ephesus to Macedonia (20:1).
22. In Macedonia and Achaia (20:2, 3).
23. The journey from Corinth to Jerusalem (20:4—21:16).

V. Paul's Imprisonment and Final Work at Rome:
1. Paul's reception by the church in Jerusalem (21:17–26).
2. Paul's arrest in Jerusalem (21:27–36).
3. Address to the people in the Hebrew language (21:37—22:29).
4. Address before the Sanhedrin (22:30—23:11).
5. The plot of the Jews, and Paul's removal to Caesarea (23:12–35).
6. Paul's examination before Felix (24:1–23).
7. Paul before Felix and Drusilla (24:24–27).
8. Examination before Festus: Appeal to Caesar (25:1–12).
9. Before Agrippa and Bernice (25:13—26:32).
10. The voyage from Caesarea to Fair Havens (27:1–8).
11. The storm and the shipwreck (27:9–44).
12. On the island of Melita (28:1–10).
13. From Melita to Rome (28:11–15).
14. Paul's conference with the Jews in Rome (28:16–28).
15. Two years' labor in Rome (28:30, 31).

Second day.—§ 76. *The reassembling and organization of Jesus' followers:* Acts 1:1—2:47. Read 1:1–14, noticing Luke's reference to his previous book (vs. 1*a*) and its contents (vss. 1*b*–3); how these opening verses connect themselves with and enlarge upon the closing part of the Gospel, especially the faith that Christ is in heaven and yet will be with them in power (vss. 4–11) until his final return in glory (vs. 11). Why this repeated emphasis upon these ideas so earnestly held by the more ardent Christians of the first century? Were some disciples growing lukewarm in faith, beginning to doubt the truth of these beliefs? How startling to find Jesus' mother and brothers in this early assembly at Jerusalem (though, to be sure, Luke excluded Mark's account of their previous unbelief: Mark 3:20–21, 31:35)! After reading vss. 15–26, ask why Judas' place had to be filled at all, and what the chief qualifications and tasks of an apostle were (cf. Luke 24:47, 48).

Third day.—Read 2:1–47. What was the real religious experience that lay behind the symbolic narrative in 2:1–13? What do the words "rushing," "tongues," "fire," and "Spirit" suggest as to the startling power and joyful inspiration of this revival experience? What do the names of vss. 8–12 suggest to Luke as he writes years after the gospel has begun its larger work? How does Peter explain this new enthusiasm and power displayed by Jesus' followers (vss. 14–36)? How do you account for such great results as those mentioned in vss. 37–47? Does Jesus' ministry in Galilee and Jerusalem account for this, in part?

Fourth day.—§ 77. *The growth of the church in Jerusalem:* Acts 3:1—8:1*a*. Read chap. 3. Did the early church at once renounce Judaism and temple-

worship, its members calling themselves Christians instead of Jews (vss. 1 and 13*a* especially)? Were these people now beginning to see the real significance of Jesus' life and death (vss. 13–26)? Notice the striking titles here applied to Jesus.

Fifth day.—According to chap. 4, what was the emphatic creed of these first Christians? What great experiences gave them this courage and daily increased their power as religious leaders?

Sixth day.—How, according to 5:1–11, did the disciples express their sense of brotherhood? How do you account for such power as vss. 12–16 suggest? Read vss. 17–42 (and cf. 4:1, as well as the case of Jesus). Who were the most determined enemies of this Jesus movement? What great convictions held the disciples loyal to their message (vss. 29, 32, 42)? Note the author's slight confusion of dates (cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX, v, 1, 2) in vss. 33–37. Judas of Galilee appeared when Jesus was a boy of about ten years of age (6 A.D.); Gamaliel, of course, lived about 30 A.D.; and Theudas led his fated movement about 44 A.D., some fourteen years after these events are said to have occurred.

Seventh day.—In 6:1–7, notice the two types of people in the early church, and how naturally offices were created to meet actual need. How were these first officials chosen? Summarize all the factors which tend to explain so great success (vs. 7). Read 6:8—8:1*a*. Why did Stephen take up this larger and more trying work (vss. 8–10)? Was their charge against Stephen well-founded (vss. 13, 14)? How radical is his position; and does he admit the charge? How great a character is here revealed; and what effect upon the church life and activities did his martyrdom have? Note Saul's dramatic position and influence (8:1*a*).

Eighth day.—§ 78. *The church scattered by persecution: the work broadened and deepened:* 8:1*b*—12:25. Read 8:1*b*–4. Why should Stephen's death stir up so much trouble, and who now stands out as leader of the anti-Jesus movement? Notice how this persecution differed from those that preceded, and the effect of it as respects the spread of the gospel. Putting yourself as much as possible in Saul's place, try to form a just idea of his character and of the motives with which he persecuted Christians.

Ninth day.—In reading 8:5–40, notice what various types were attracted by the gospel; what emphasis the evangelists laid upon the Holy Spirit, baptism, belief in Jesus as Messiah, and Old Testament prophecy. Read 9:1–31. Gain a definite idea of the author's view of Paul's spiritual experience—the change that took place in his opinions, convictions, feelings, purposes, and relations in life. Recall from Gal. 1:15–24 Paul's own story as to how he spent the next preparatory years, and consider the bearing of these events upon his future career.

Tenth day.—Follow Peter's early evangelistic work in Acts 9:32—10:48. How do time and experience gradually enlarge his views of Jesus' mission and God's plan for the world (especially 10:28, 29, 34, 35)? May years of tradition and our author's highly dramatic nature possibly have led to more or less idealization with regard to these narratives?

Eleventh day.—Read 11:1–18. In breaking away from these deepest and long-cherished convictions of the Jewish people, do you imagine that Peter's conscience was ill at ease, accusing and defending him by turns? Why should the

Jerusalem brethren reprimand him so sternly (vs. 2)? Had they forgotten the broader spirit of their Master as expressed in Matt. 28:19, 20? Is there danger today that, in our zeal for the upholding of church customs, we may be working against the clear will of God?

Twelfth day.—Read 11:19—12:25. How valuable to us would be the records of these devoted evangelists whose names, even, have not been handed down in history! Note how very gradually these Jewish workers broadened their sympathies to take in the gentiles; and how even Barnabas, so cautiously sent out by the conservative disciples of Jerusalem, was swept away by the power of the revival among the gentiles (11:19*b*–24). No wonder he felt the need of Saul of Tarsus, a great spirit akin to his own (11:25–26). Think of a Jewish-gentile church! Does the name "Christian," never used till now (vs. 26), suggest the new and wonderful bond which united these hitherto hostile peoples?

Thirteenth day.—§ 79. *Missions to Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece:* Acts 13:1—21:16. Read 13:1—14:28. What does 13:2–4*a* suggest as to the unique importance of this tour of Barnabas and Paul? Note again the sterling worth of these two men (11:22–26; 12:25; 13:1, 2*a*). Tracing the journey upon the map, ask: With whom (Jews or gentiles) did they begin their work? What obstacles did they meet? Remember the history of John Mark, later the honored author of our Second Gospel (see 12:12; 15:37–39; Col. 4:10; Philem., vs. 24; II Tim. 4:11). How significant is this journey when you recall what it cost Paul (14:19); also in the light of the letter written by Paul to these Galatian Christians?

Fourteenth day.—Read 15:1–35. Recall that you have read in Gal. 2:1–12 Paul's account of this same event; but read the Acts story as revealing the viewpoint held thirty or forty years later. Why does the present author pass so lightly over this controversy, leaving the impression of perfect harmony, while Paul's words suggest no compromise whatever, but rather a fight to the end for the principle at stake? Does time usually tend to soften the memory of differences?

Fifteenth day.—Read 15:36—16:10. Recalling Mark's seeming lack of heroism during the first journey (13:13), note the author's further comment (15:38) and judge as to which side he seems to take (vs. 40). In the light of the Galatian letter and Paul's well-known convictions, may we say that Paul is justified in having Timothy circumcised (16:3); or is this a compromise again, as seen by the author? How did the Spirit make his will known to Paul (16:6, 7)? Imagine Paul's feelings as he plans to enter Europe with his message! Follow Paul's journey on the map.

Sixteenth day.—Glance hastily over the four "we-sections" referred to in § 75 (16:10–17; 20:5–15; 21:1–18; 27:1—28:16), noting the use of the first personal pronoun, the wealth of detail in the sections, and the vivid touches of the eyewitness, who must have been with Paul as companion. Is this a portion of Luke's diary, kept in his youthful days of travel with the great apostle? This is, at any rate, evidently a written source employed by the author of Acts.

Seventeenth day.—Read 16:11—18:23*a*. Recalling II Cor. 11:23–29, and putting yourself in the place of these uncomplaining heroes, ask what your feelings would be under such circumstances. Could you be faithful "even unto death,"

as were these men? Think of the weariness, yet the untold joy, they had as they reached home again (18:22, 23*a*) and told what God had accomplished through their labors and sufferings!

Eighteenth day.—In similar fashion, trace Paul's third journey (18:23*b*—21:16), noting his affectionate interest in his Galatian friends; the fact that Ephesus contained, even after a quarter of a century, men who were proud to acknowledge themselves as disciples of John the Baptist (18:24—19:7); the new hardships encountered so fearlessly; the increasing success of the work; and the growing body of able workers who rallied to the help of Paul. Luke has seen these men and often heard their stories of adventure.

Nineteenth day.—§ 80. *Paul's imprisonment and final work at Rome:* Acts 21:17—28:31. Recall the events which have happened since Paul's last arrival at Jerusalem (15:1–29; Gal. 2:1–10); what journeys he has made; what letters he has written; what mental experiences he has passed through; what conflicts and oppositions he has endured.

Twentieth day.—Read with care 21:17–26, noticing (1) who is the head of the church in Jerusalem, (2) to whom Paul gave an account of his work, and how it was received, (3) the position of the major portion of the Jewish Christians in relation to the law, (4) the course Paul was urged to pursue, (5) the motives for this course. (Recall, why he had come to Jerusalem [Rom. 15:25–27].)

Twenty-first day.—Read 21:27–36 attentively, noticing (1) with whom the attack on Paul originated, (2) what they charged against him, (3) to what motives they appealed, (4) the relation of the Roman authorities to the affair. Imagine the feelings of Luke, as he peruses his diary and recalls these stirring events. What changes since then!

Twenty-second day.—In the face of such danger, could Paul fail to recall Jesus' last days, and the stoning of Stephen—two martyrs to this same cause for which Paul was pleading? Read 21:37—22:29. In reading Paul's speech, remember the circumstances that led to it, the persons to whom it was addressed, and noticing that it is biographical in form (telling facts about his own life), but evidently argumentative in purpose, consider what Paul meant to prove to his hearers by it.

Twenty-third day.—What in Paul's speech so angered the Jews? Could he not have presented his message more tactfully and have won these many Jews, as Jesus succeeded in doing, rather than demanding too much of them? Notice the use which Paul made of his Roman citizenship and recall a previous occasion on which he referred to it; also in general the relation of the Roman government to the Jews and to the other nations among whom Paul labored. Thus far, has the imperial government been a hindrance or a help to the progress of Christianity? What pride must Luke have taken in this thought?

Twenty-fourth day.—Having read 22:30—23:11, consider (1) in what sense Paul's statement (23:1) was true, (2) whether the action of the high priest was justified or not, (3) whether Paul did right in his answer to the high priest, (4) in what sense Paul could say that he was a Pharisee; and in what sense he was on trial for believing in the resurrection. What does vs. 11 suggest as to the secret of Paul's power and courage? Read vss. 12–15, and consider the reason of the bitter hatred of the Jews toward Paul. Read vss. 16–24, and consider what led

Lysias to protect Paul; was it personal attachment to him or favorable attitude toward Christianity, or only a sense of official duty? Read vss. 26–30, and notice whether Lysias told the truth throughout. Read vss. 31–35, and with the map trace the route. Note Luke's propensity for details, as in 23:23–34. Does this characteristic tend to prove Luke's claim to accuracy in his investigations (cf. Luke 1:1–4)? Note, also, our author's dramatic power in presenting scenes in the lives of his heroes.

Twenty-fifth day.—Read 24:1–23. Notice the method of the trial (what should we call Tertullus in our courts today?). Notice carefully the charges made against Paul and consider how far they were true. Observe this early occurrence of the name Nazarenes as applied to Christians. In vss. 10–13 recall the charges and notice Paul's answer. In vss. 14–16 notice that Paul refers to the charge with reference to the "sect" of the Nazarenes, and bearing in mind that this same word "sect" was used with reference to the Sadducees (5:17) and Pharisees (15:5) notice what Paul claims as the belief of his sect. Notice in vs. 17 the allusion to his purpose in coming to Jerusalem, and in vs. 18 the reference to the charge of vs. 6. Is vs. 20 a confession that he did wrong in uttering the words he referred to? Notice especially in this whole speech what Paul says as to whether to be a Christian, such as he, was to be a renegade Jew, or most truly a Jew. Did Paul, or Stephen, or Peter, or Jesus ever think for a moment that this "new teaching" was anything other than purest Judaism? Think back over Paul's teaching and ask yourself what Paul's idea of Christian manhood was. Did he probably present these, his deepest convictions, before his judge, as well as the few ideas which Luke has recorded?

Twenty-sixth day.—Read 24:24—26:32. Consider what the facts here recorded indicate as to the character of Felix, and what side of the character of the Roman ruler is here illustrated. Consider (1) what it meant to appeal to Caesar, (2) Paul's probable motive in appealing, and (3) the effect of the appeal. Read 25:13–27 carefully, and, bearing in mind the character of the several persons present, form a conception of the scene, both in its outward features and more especially in its moral significance. In chap. 26 notice especially the emphasis here laid upon the resurrection of Jesus and the preaching of the gospel to the gentiles. Why does Paul so closely connect them?

Twenty-seventh day.—Again Luke seems to draw upon his journal for the many details which are crowded into 27:1—28:16. Look back over the preceding excerpts from the diary and then read this final portion (see § 75 for the four passages), noting the Lukan style, dramatic, detailed, idealistic as it is. Note the author's evident admiration for Paul; what a masterly picture he draws of the great hero. Does 27:34*b* (cf. Luke 21:18) suggest the comforting saying which Paul and Luke remembered and talked over as coming from the lips of the Christ? Again a Roman official extends courtesy to bearers of the gospel message (28:7). Trace the entire journey on the map. How had Paul planned to enter Rome (Rom. 1:15; 15:22–24, 28–32)? Could anything be more discouraging?

Twenty-eighth day.—Read 28:17–31. Notice the character of Paul's imprisonment in Rome, and the use which he made of the comparative freedom which he enjoyed. Conceive as definitely as possible Paul's position in Rome, including his relation (1) to the Roman authorities, and particularly to the soldiers, (2) to

the Jews, (3) to the Christians; recall his letter to the Romans. Does Paul ever seem to weary of his message (vs. 23*b*)? How does he prove Jesus' messiahship from the Old Testament Law? From the Prophets? Recall the frequent and unique emphasis Luke (like Paul) lays upon the work, power, and directing presence of the Holy Spirit throughout his two books (as in vs. 25).

Twenty-ninth day.—Glance through the Book of Acts now, searching out all references to gentiles and the broader sweep of the gospel, noticing, however, that in practically every case, Paul and the other workers give the Jews first chance to accept the message. In spite of all difficulties and dangers and disappointments, observe how Paul (and Luke) bears up bravely, determined to make all experiences further the deathless message of the Cross.

Thirtieth day.—Thinking back over the literature so far studied (Paul's letters, Mark, Matthew, Luke, and Acts), observe, how, at first no doubt with hesitation and amazement, but finally with gratitude and joy, these Christian evangelists have all come to see that God has taken the whole world into his consideration and deals with all on the same terms. How hard it is for them, in spite of the utterances of some of the prophets (not to mention Jesus' acts and words along this same line) to grasp the inclusiveness of the divine love and the universal scope of the gospel! But all of these authors now write from the broader world, and its viewpoint. Are not Paul's words in Rom. 11:33–36, implying so much hope for both gentile and Jew, really echoed in the climactic thoughts of Matthew (Matt. 28:18–20), and in Luke's writings (Luke 24:47) and Acts 10:34–38? No wonder these men all write with passionate enthusiasm: with such a God, such a Christ, such a guiding Spirit, and such a gospel, can anything be impossible? Past victories are but a foretaste of the great Day which is surely fast approaching!

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME XLIII MAY 1914 NUMBER 5

ENTERTAINING PEOPLE INTO THE KINGDOM OF GOD

In Jesus' day the Kingdom of God suffered violence and men of violence were to take it by force. Nowadays some of us think that its violence is a feature of men's dinners and its capture a duty of basket-ball teams. When these fail we still hope to introduce religion surreptitiously between stereopticon slides and to deepen foreign mission enthusiasm by pageants.

Amusement is legitimate. In many a community the church must fight all but single-handed against theaters and dance halls which are vulgarizing and debasing boys and girls. Such a church may rightfully and of necessity undertake to furnish rational entertainment for its community.

But is entertainment the real function of the church? If such were the case the church is already outgrown. It cannot compete with commercialized amusements or with municipal playgrounds.

And it will be rightfully outgrown, for it will have ceased to do the thing which as a church it ought to do: bring men and God together for the salvation of men.

It is amazing how mad our modern world is after amusement. The feudal lord kept his fool, who was anything but a simpleton, but our modern world is content with nothing that is not highly spiced with entertainment. Our preachers must have their stories, our professors must be clever as well as learned, and our evangelists (God forgive us) must be vulgar before our attention is much attracted.

Is it any wonder that our world has lost a sense of reverence? The fear of the Lord is no longer the beginning of wisdom. For wisdom itself is attending a dancing class.

Play is a legitimate right of children, but any person who thinks that a child's needs are satisfied on the playground simply does not know children. Quite as truly that man has much to learn who thinks that sturdiness of character, abhorrence of sensuality, heroism that scorns delicate living and welcomes sacrifice can be produced without listening to the Hebrew prophet and the English Puritan.

The world in which we live is not good natured. We have not yet quenched the lust for war, or abolished sin, or ended death. A religion that overlooks men's sins, men's sufferings, and men's death is only a diversion. It does not save men—it hardly keeps them out of mischief.

The sensuousness of our day will not be driven out by amusement. The only message of salvation that will cut into our selfishness and recklessness is one that makes us morally uncomfortable; that does not distract our attention from sin; that makes us feel the doom impending upon lives and social orders which have taught themselves to believe that we live in a good-natured universe, and are responsible to a good-natured God.

A minister should not speak comfortably to comfortable people. He ought to make such folk morally uncomfortable.

One reason why men prefer golf to church is because they have drifted into the notion that golf and church-going belong to the same general class of interests. Truth need not be deadened in order that it may find one's conscience, but a church crowded with people who want to be entertained is a poor recruiting-ground for the army of the Lord. Better twelve men who are ready to die for their Master than four thousand who come to him for free lunches.

Seriousness and gentleness, candor and fraternity, solace and inspiration—these are some of the characteristics of a genuine religion. To doubt their power and to seek crowds by cajolery, by appeal to that which is frivolous, hysterical, cheap, and vulgar, is to publish a lack of faith in the gospel of the kingdom that is love, joy, and peace in the Holy Spirit.

SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER

FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., LL.D.
President of the Union Theological Seminary
New York

The world of scholars and all who love the Bible suffered a grievous loss when Professor Driver's earthly work came to an end, on the morning of Thursday, February 26, 1914. He had spent in Old Testament studies a life of unusual concentration and effectiveness, and exerted an influence far wider than he ever claimed or knew.

He was born in Southampton, October 2, 1846. His father was a successful merchant there. He had retired from business before the end of his long life, and took great pleasure in the established reputation of his son, with whom he made his home in Oxford during his later years. Samuel Rolles Driver was educated at Winchester and at New College, Oxford, where his taste for study was fostered and received its direction. On a thorough classical basis (his B.A. degree was a First in Lit. Hum. in 1869) he acquired Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac, with a fair knowledge of other Semitic languages. In Hebrew and Syriac he took scholarships and prizes. He was made Fellow of New College in 1870, and Tutor in 1875, and held these positions until, in 1883, on the death of Pusey, he was appointed Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. This was his seat of vantage, to which he added new distinction, until his death. His marriage took place in 1891, and his married life was one of mutual devotion, great happiness, beauty, and hospitality. His wife and four children survive him.

To the world at large he was known chiefly as a scholar. There was no better one in his time. I have mentioned his concentration. He delimited his field when his studies became independent, and was content with it. He sought no reputation beyond it. But within it he felt responsible for mastery. His acquisitive and his retentive powers were equally marked. He became learned, and his unusual memory kept his learning available; his associates and pupils had advantage from this a thousand times. He had also a mind of singular precision and his judgment was balanced and comprehensive. On occasion, especially in his rare controversial writing, he showed brilliance, but his chief characteristic was not brilliance, still less daring—so closely akin to recklessness, by which, in oriental and biblical fields, some have lost the general confidence. His chief characteristics were sobriety of temper, exactness of method, and solidity of result. He had an instinct for the thoroughly reasonable. He did not care for speculation. He was not timid, but he was deliberate and cautious. He took no position which he had not tested. When he stated a proposition he was always sure that he could maintain it. He always examined things for himself. He built his house from the bottom. But he

was not a radical in the current sense. Extreme men were sometimes impatient with him because he did not go faster and farther. Such impatience did not affect him at all. He went as fast and as far as he could clearly see the way. His movement was not like a cavalry dash, which startles, but holds no ground. When he moved, he moved forward to stay. He intrenched himself in the new camp and did not allow himself to be dislodged. His conquests were permanent. I believe there are no lessons needed among younger biblical scholars so much as those of his life—thoroughness, independence, deliberation, judiciousness. His work will endure, not as a finality—no human scholarship is final—but as a secure base for further progress, when much contemporary writing about the Old Testament has come to have only antiquarian interest.

These substantial qualities give their value to all his books: to his *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, a standard now for twenty-three years; to his commentaries, always painstaking, intelligible, and enlightening; to his important grammatical, textual, and lexical work; to his public lectures, his many encyclopedia articles, his reviews—even his published sermons. All the results of his own studies became tempered tools for other workmen to use. Those whom he has trained in their use already form his school, and a new generation will learn from him through them.

Oxford itself soon recognized his unique qualities. He was widely trusted and held responsible university posts. His reputation spread. While still a Fellow of New College he became a member of the Old Testament Revision Company. He was as far as possible from being an ecclesiastic, but he was examining chaplain to the Bishop of Southwell for twenty years, and he addressed at least one church congress in notable words. He became a Fellow of the British Academy. He wrote often for the *Guardian* and for the *Contemporary Review*—always weightily. Trinity College, Dublin, gave him an honorary degree; then, in succession, Glasgow, Cambridge, and Aberdeen. In 1910 he was made corresponding member of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences. These distinctions betokened widespread respect. His chosen studies were related to beliefs held sacred by his countrymen. He had become the chief leader in those studies by assiduity, patience, independence, courage, moderation, and honesty.

His public influence began at a time critical for biblical study in England and in America as well. The method of historical and literary inquiry which reaches conclusions by induction from the facts observed had triumphed, and its consistent results were rapidly gaining acceptance, in Germany and Holland. Wellhausen's epoch-making work had just appeared. Kuenen was rewriting his *Introduction*. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* had admitted to its columns Robertson Smith's "Bible" and Wellhausen's "Israel." The adherents of traditional views in Great Britain were many. The voluminous *Speaker's Commentary* and like works, or less scholarly ones, were current among them. They were alarmed and many felt that religion was imperiled by the reconstruction and rearrange-

ment of Old Testament writings. Robertson Smith came under suspicion in Scotland, and at length lost his professorship. It was a question whether English-speaking Bible students should be cut off from the stream of scientific progress and be left to stagnation and enfeebled religion, or should find the man thoroughgoing enough to be their real leader, wisely moderate enough to quiet prejudice as far as prejudice could be quieted, and in a position conspicuous enough to give him standing and power. Driver (who had been known as a sound philologian, had shown among the Revisers his skill in finding English equivalents for the Hebrew, and, both there and in the *Variorum Bible*, his competence in emending the Old Testament text) succeeded, in the most important Old Testament post in England, a venerable professor whose interest had been ecclesiastical even more than biblical, and whose main service to the church had been in quite other fields than those of exegesis and criticism. The new incumbent was young and vigorous, alive to the situation, trained in the methods of modern scientific study, reverent toward the Scriptures, considerate toward the past, and far from revolutionary in the temper of his mind. He proved the man for the hour. Respect for him and his attainments gave respectability to his critical opinions even among such colleagues as did not accept them, and the number of those who accepted them grew and multiplied. His *Introduction* proved the crown of his work in this direction. By it, directly and indirectly, more than by any other single agency, an Old Testament criticism, sober-minded and open-eyed, has made its way in England.

His influence on the more complex situation in this country also has been very great. When he became Regius Professor at Oxford, Dr. Briggs was already maintaining the right of biblical criticism, and Professor (not yet President) Harper was awakening in wide circles a new zeal for Hebrew and the books written in it. They had Professor Driver's warm sympathy. Indeed, one of his earliest publications in Old Testament criticism was a series of papers asked for, but, when it came to the point, declined, by an American periodical. He followed with close interest the progress of controversy here, and the effect of his *Introduction* and his commentaries—published too late to contribute to the immediate results of that controversy—has been growing with every year since then.

In an honorable sense he was a popularizer as well as a learned specialist. He addressed himself, time and again, to the average intelligence, never undervaluing it, never condescending to it, yet setting it no impossible tasks. He made issues plain. More than anyone else he showed English-speaking people what to think about the Old Testament and how to study it. This intrenched him in the esteem of increasing numbers.

Those who came near enough to him for personal acquaintance, and especially those who enjoyed his friendship, found fresh grounds for regard. He was very simple and sincere. His speech was straightforward. A turgid or affected style, in speech or book, made him uneasy. He was modest and undemonstrative, with something of a scholar's

shyness, but also of a scholar's self-respect, which is respect for exact knowledge and for truth, the scholar's aim. He was not at all resentful, but when his deliberate opinions were attacked, or he himself attacked for holding them, as sometimes occurred, he was prompt to repel the attack for the sake of the truth and of people who might be misled. Otherwise he was never in haste to express an opinion, nor eager to express one at all. He shrank from prominence and especially from praise. He had no vanity. There was a deep vein of humble-mindedness in him. He had no pretentiousness. His mind grasped capably whatever topics came before it, but he was dogmatic regarding very few. He did not talk much about politics or church affairs. He did not feel himself called upon to be a reforming advocate of many causes, and in private habit he was quietly conservative, but he could be counted on for broad and generous views. As the advocate of opinions novel to many, and apparently loose or destructive, opponents of these sometimes were led on to assail him personally. Some, more radical, sharply condemned his cautiousness. But he never spoke sharply or petulantly about anyone. He found explanations and excuses for his detractors. His attachments were strong. He had a loyal nature and grappled his friends to his heart with hooks of steel, never feeling the need of many words. His industry was unflagging, and so was his kindness to fellow-workers and to students. His profoundest affection was for his wife and children—unique and rich relationships. His pleasures were as simple as his character. His chief ones were his books and his home. He enjoyed travel, for objects that appealed to his mind, yet not without his wife. He had long hoped to visit America, but the plan was several times postponed and never carried out. No journeys would have attracted him if he had been obliged to take them alone, or if his home had not awaited him at the end.

His religious life was quiet and steadfast, like the rest of him. He was no friend of religious conversation, in the ordinary sense. Things of religious import were very sacred, hardly to be approached with words. His sermons showed a high restraint—the unrhetorical setting forth of holy things. His religious experience was bound up with his life. His favorite hymns were sung at his funeral, and among them were "Just as I Am, without One Plea," and "Jesus, Lover of My Soul." He was a great scholar and a simple Christian. His love of truth was merged in his love of God.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

LUCIUS HOPKINS MILLER
Professor of Biblical Instruction, Princeton University

This is the fourth and final article of Professor Miller's series upon New Testament material dealing with Jesus. It moves farther into the region of theology than have the others, and for that reason may seem to move farther away from the New Testament itself. Yet even those who differ from some of the author's detailed positions will feel the constructive temper of his entire discussion. The interest in the subject of the person of Jesus is so great that we shall publish in the next issue of the BIBLICAL WORLD *another paper on the same subject by Professor William Adams Brown. Both of these discussions lay repeated emphasis upon a vital evangelicalism, which is not a matter of doctrine, but of spiritual valuation and experience.*

Christians are agreed on the divinity of Christ far more than the ebb and flow of theological terminology would indicate. If the truth were only realized, or admitted, many conservatives and liberals, who now think the gap between them wide and irreducible, would find themselves standing close together. The trouble is that many of the former insist on having the exaltation of Jesus expressed in their terms alone; otherwise, they deny that the exaltation is real or sufficient. On the other hand, many of the latter refuse to use language strong enough to express their true appreciation of Jesus, for fear they will be understood as subscribing to ideas they no longer hold. They deny themselves biblical phraseology which most aptly and beautifully expresses the fundamental agreement which may still exist between the views of a modern thinker and those of the historic church regarding Jesus Christ. The effect of this attitude may be unfortunate, but its motive is clear and praiseworthy. These men do not wish to fall into the unsteady arms of compromise, for the compromiser is abroad in the land.

The New Phase of the Question

The status of the problem for many men has changed utterly. Science cannot dictate to us what our faith shall be, but it has established a method of procedure which must be followed in all historical investigation. And the problem of the divinity of Christ is, in the first instance, a historical problem. We must ascertain the historical facts by means of scientific, historical processes before we seek to pass judgment on the significance of the facts, else we are dealing with unknown quantities. Thus the old deductive method is gone forever. That is, we cannot begin with God and deduce therefrom the divinity of Jesus. God is the unknown, or partially unknown quantity that can be determined only by equations of historical fact, and these equations can be satisfied only by means of the historical method. I do not mean to say that we can prove the existence of God by means of the historical

method. Far from it. What I maintain is that any vital faith in God springs out of facts; that an educated man should consider the whole realm of historic fact in forming his conception of God; that, finally, such a consideration, to be valid, involves the use of the historical method. The problem may be put in this way: What sort of God, if any, do the facts of life lead us to believe in? Does the historical Jesus stand as *the* gateway, *par excellence*, to belief in such a God? If so, what should be our final estimate of Jesus?

The Teaching of the New Testament

The church has been right in emphasizing the person of Christ as the central fact of Christianity. In this it has but followed the example of the earliest disciples of Jesus. Perhaps I should use the word "personality," because "person" has acquired a meaning which is beyond my present thought. It was not Jesus the teacher, alone or chiefly, who won disciples. It was Jesus the person; Jesus the man. He lived a life that compelled a following and those Jews who followed him gave him the highest rank they could, next to God himself, namely, messiahship. To them he was *the* messenger of God, bringing light and life; subordinate to God, but second only to him. This is the messianic viewpoint, and in the Synoptic Gospels it is absolutely dominant.

At some time between this primitive period and the appearance of the Gospel of John, there arose the view of the person of Jesus so appealingly set forth in the beautiful stories of the infancy. We need not discuss here whether these narratives of Matthew and Luke arose before or after the time of Paul, nor whether they were placed where they are by the evangelists themselves or by later editors. It satisfies our present purpose to remark that here we have a distinct attempt to account for Jesus' divine origin, this being already believed in on other grounds. We do not have to import myths in order to account for this phenomenon. The Hebrew ancestors of these Jewish Christians had often manifested a tendency to ascribe a supernatural birth to those whom they regarded as their great religious leaders, as in the cases of Isaac and of Samuel. A similar but, naturally, much stronger tendency gave rise, probably, to the accounts of Jesus' birth and infancy. The idea these stories embody is that of "physical filiation." They were creations of "popular devotion, destined to explain the divine sonship of Christ by his supernatural generation." This important product of popular theology eventually became a cardinal factor in the final shaping of the Christian creeds, in which it was amalgamated with various other elements—primitive Jewish-Christian, Pauline, Johannine, and others. That it was not such a factor in the first century is evident from the fact that it is ignored by Paul and the author of the Gospel of John. Indeed, such a theory as that of "physical filiation" is far from compatible with either of these other historic Christian viewpoints, namely, the Pauline and the Johannine.

Paul's Christian experience was of the transcendent type. Its conscious beginning was surrounded by abnormal conditions and the vision of Christ on the road to Damascus was ever the burn-

ing center of his religious and theological universe. Further, he cut himself off, in large part, from the details of Jesus' historical career which so determined the thought of his Jewish-Christian brothers. Hence it was but natural that the heavenly Christ should be the burden of his thought and that correspondingly lofty conceptions should appear in his writings. In his way he gave Jesus the first place. And yet he everywhere subordinates him to God, "even the Father" to whom "he shall deliver up the kingdom" at "the end."

What Paul did in his way, the author of the Fourth Gospel also did, but in a way peculiar to himself. Accustomed to the thought of the Philonic school, he exalted his Lord and Master in the terms that lay at hand. In so doing, he performed a great service for the thinking people of his day. Jesus was to him "the Word made flesh." This was understandable to a Greek and doubtless many were led to a proper estimate of Jesus through this way of describing him. The Philonic definitions of "the Word" are somewhat confusing. Sometimes "the Word" is spoken of as equal with God and sometimes in terms of subordination to him. It was really a term of mediation for a day when the gap between God and man was felt to be much greater than it is now felt to be or, as we may remark in passing, than Jesus evidently felt it to be. "The Word" was the highest of all divine intermediaries; the first step of God downward toward man. The author of the Fourth Gospel possessed a deep Christian experience together with an Alexandrian education and he could not find a better or more suitable name for his Master than this term of mediation current in the Alexandrian school.

The Rise of the Creeds

Two centuries of conflict, conquest, and compromise passed over the Christian faith. Out of these things came the great creeds of Christendom. Christianity was enthroned upon the seat of power. No longer could it be said, "Not many wise, not many mighty, are called." Probably the great moving life of the religion was then, as always, down in the midst of the mass of common humanity, but the shaping of Christian polity and doctrine was no longer a naïve thing. It was in the hands of men skilled in politics. "Practical" men controlled these things and "practical" then meant just what it means now: a full recognition of the force of modifying circumstances. What were these modifying circumstances? They were the customs of the Greco-Roman world, its methods of organization, and its modes of thought. It is not pertinent to discuss here the details of the adaptation to environment which Christianity underwent, consciously and unconsciously, in the first three centuries of its history. I do not agree with those who hold that all this represented decay. On the contrary, it was inevitable, and it has had its place of value in the progress of mankind. Furthermore, as far as the creeds were concerned, it represented, at least in part, a sincere attempt to explain to the thinking people of the day how the God of the heavens had actually come into contact with a sorely needy humanity, through Christ. The creeds did for the time what now we see every age must do for itself anew; and, for my part, as

against the Arians, I think the truth then lay with the Athanasians.

But we have gone a long way upon the path of knowledge since the fourth century. We know more about the human mind and its subtle workings; more about the Bible and the way in which it was written; and, historically at least, more about Jesus of Nazareth and the circumstances surrounding him and his first disciples. This and other new knowledge has forever buried the Athanasian monuments in the sands of oblivion, removing them from the sight of a modern man who is seeking practical religious realities. Perhaps I should say that this ought to be the situation. As a matter of fact, a wrong conception of dogma has fastened the Athanasian viewpoint on the Christian church, as something infallible and unchangeable. Otherwise, we should not have even to refer to it here.

The problem of describing satisfactorily Jesus' relation to God and to the world is today, in many respects, an entirely different problem from that confronting the Church Fathers. In fact, much more recent phases of the problem are antiquated. The choice that is usually held out at present, of accepting historic Trinitarianism or of being classed as a Unitarian, is an incorrect way of presenting the issue. This false dilemma is due partly to mere polemic, partly to failure to understand the existing situation, and partly to the laziness or the legalism of minds which cannot get on without convenient categories which save time and effort. The issue today is simply between what is Christian and what is non-Christian. The choice lies between espousing the Christian view of life and paying homage to some other view. And by espousing the Christian view of life I mean making effective in thought and in daily living Jesus' fundamental ideas of God, man, the world, and their interrelations; the ideas which we find controlling in his teaching and in his life. This practical, personal appropriation of the spirit of Jesus is, of course, the main problem for us all, but the mind is justified in seeking the implications involved and in asking further, "What think ye of Christ?" This is not merely a speculative task whose results are purely theoretical. A clear answer has practical value in that it clarifies many moral and religious questions.

The Incarnation and the Doctrine of Human Nature

The belief in the necessity, for salvation, of a complete incarnation of God in human form has been due to a prior belief, namely, that human nature is essentially and entirely corrupt. In early Christian thought, beginning at least as early as Paul, the evident evil in human life was joined with the biblical story of the fall of man. The theory of the complete corruption and perverseness of man was the result. On such a theory it was natural to think of God as bringing salvation to man solely through a miraculous incarnation. Thus arose the necessity, in the minds of the thinkers of that day, for regarding Jesus as the "God-Man," in the historic meaning of that term, namely, "God and man in one person forever."

That God is continually incarnating himself in human life, a religious man must surely hold; and the one differentiating mark of the Christian believer is

that he believes Jesus to have been the supreme incarnation of the God-life in man. As Sabatier says, "The Heavenly Father lives within the Son of Man, and the dogma of the God-Man, interpreted by the piety of each Christian, not by the subtle metaphysics of the doctors and the schools, becomes the central and distinguishing dogma of Christianity." But one difficulty with the position of historic Trinitarianism is that it fails to recognize the fundamental view of man revealed in the Synoptic Gospels—a view which is supported by modern psychology and by our everyday experience—namely, that human nature is not totally corrupt; that, as Jesus taught, all men are potentially "children of God"; that is, there is in man, by nature, a divine element to build on. Hebrew tradition expresses this same view in Gen. 1:26–27, where we read, "And God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness' . . . . and God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." The story of the fall, whatever it may have meant to the ancient Hebrew, did not succeed in effacing from his mind this belief.

What is needed for salvation, then, is such an incarnation of the divine life in human form as to lead men to turn their backs on their lower, animal origin and turn their faces toward God and his will. Many leaders of mankind have performed this task measurably, but one may easily come to the conviction that Jesus has done it supremely and for all time. If one yields to him the practical lordship of life, salvation will inevitably follow. We may consider this salvation as sudden, when it involves a complete change of attitude, as is often the case—conversion, in the root sense of the word. Or we may regard it as gradual, in that it means the steady and often long-drawn-out attempt to realize the Christian attitude in all the relationships of life. Again, we may regard it as present and this-worldly, in that it brings true satisfaction, joy, and achievement in this life. Finally, we may think of it as a future possession, or state of being after death. Under certain conditions the continuance of life after death would be intolerable. Can we conceive of its being "blessed" apart from a capacity to appreciate and appropriate the divine life revealed in Jesus? For such a salvation—and who would not concede its sufficiency?—it is not necessary to subscribe to the historic definition of the incarnation which the church has formulated and insisted upon. If one can say with Paul, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," as a true Christian must be able to say, he is in a position to secure all the religious and ethical benefits which Christianity in any form has ever been able to proffer.

We may cast bulwarks about this position, at this point, by reminding ourselves of Jesus' own teaching and also of the position of the earliest disciples. To my mind, Jesus clearly taught that he was the Messiah; and, to the first disciples, this was the true and final word by which to describe him. This term did not mean then what later Christian theologians, saturated with philosophic conceptions, considered it to mean. It meant merely that member of the Jewish race who was divinely "anointed" to introduce and head the "kingdom of God." Why may we not go back to the Synoptic Gospels and content ourselves

with the thought of Jesus as the introducer of the kingdom of God among men and its divine head? Then, freed from any compelling necessity regarding elaborate metaphysics and abstruse dogma, we may devote our whole energy to the supreme and eternally vital task of being introduced into the kingdom ourselves in order that we may "minister" to the many others who need the same introduction. Jesus was certainly not careful to insist on his complete infallibility in all departments of knowledge or of life, else he would never have said, "Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, even God"; nor would he have disclaimed knowledge of the exact time of the coming of the kingdom. The disciples, also, were not careful about such abstract considerations, else they would never have reported these sayings. A position sufficient for the Master himself, and for his first disciples, is surely sufficient for us; and if we go back to it, as we easily can, we shall be relieved of a great incubus and set free for the glorious, compelling, Christian task of making the real Christ-life dominant in the world.

God and the Holy Spirit

Another objection to the hitherto prevailing viewpoint is the distinction it seeks to establish between God and the Holy Spirit in the very attempt made to unite them. This is easily understandable when we consider the history of this phase of dogma. In the ancient world, especially in late Jewish thought and in the later developments of Platonism, God was conceived of as standing entirely apart from the world of men and of things, as far as his own direct activity was concerned. He was the only holy one, superior to mundane matters in his awesome majesty; or a principle of truth and goodness that could not be brought into contact with human affairs except through some intermediary. Hence the idea of angels and other intermediary beings, or principles, like the Philonic "Word" which the Fourth Gospel adopts, to bring the God-life down to earth. Hence the separative conception of the Holy Spirit of God acting as a bearer of good from God to man.

There is much truth in all these conceptions. The Christian position as embodied in Jesus' teaching is theistic, certainly. That is, God is not man and man is not God. If there is to be any impartation of the spiritual God to a man potentially, but not actually, spiritual, it must come through channels that can effectively accomplish the transference of spiritual life. History leads us to believe that such impartation is direct from God to man; the actual Spirit, which is God himself, working directly upon the potential spirit, which is man; but also propagated from man to man by the impelling power of God *in* man. Thus any religious leader of mankind is an intermediary and Jesus may be considered the supreme intermediary—not only prophet and king, but also priest, if we care for historic terminology.

But a modern thinker, of any idealistic kind whatsoever, finds it hard, if he thinks about the matter at all, to differentiate between God and the Holy Spirit of God. God is not only "a spirit" but *the* Spirit, and where the Spirit of Holiness is, there is God. What is the reason for, or the value of, differentiating them and then bringing them together again

by means of a metaphysical formula which none can understand and which has no practical religious value that cannot be secured in another way? Whatever may be said for pluralistic views of the universe in general, nothing can be said for that sort of pluralism which practically says: "Let $x=v$ and $y=x$; then v and y are identical and yet distinct." This sort of thing may do very well on paper, but it does not touch real life. As a matter of fact, the general trend of our modern thought is toward the unity of the final reality underlying the world; and in so far as this trend is actual, just so far do these ancient distinctions between God the Father and God the Holy Spirit become difficult to maintain.

Here, again, it is a comfort and a support to return to Jesus' teaching and to the position of the first disciples. In the Gospel of John, to be sure, and in the Pauline epistles, the concept of the Holy Spirit is prominent, but it is far from being the metaphysical concept of later times. In the teaching of Jesus reported in the Synoptic Gospels, that is, up to the time of his death, the idea appears in the accounts of only four separate incidents. In two of these cases the parallel passages raise a possible question regarding the correctness of the record in this particular. The third case is a quotation from Isaiah, and in the fourth, the phrase used is "Spirit of your Father." Taking all four instances exactly as they stand, the most satisfactory interpretation is that here we have either the customary Jewish circumlocution to avoid the use of the divine name, or simply the old Hebraic use of the word "spirit." Certainly nothing could be farther from the evident meaning of these passages than a metaphysical distinction between God and his Spirit. Everywhere else, and in numerous connections where we might expect to find the concept of the Holy Spirit introduced, Jesus consistently uses the word "Father" and emphasizes the direct and immediate contact between God and his children.

There are seven other occasions reported in the Synoptic Gospels in which we find the Holy Spirit mentioned. One is a citation from Isaiah and five of the others are manifestly of the Hebraic type already referred to. The seventh is the famous passage in Matt. 28:19, where the risen Jesus is reported as using the threefold formula "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." Whatever one's view of its literary history, this particular verse does not belie the truth of the statement that the Synoptic Gospels are dominated by the messianic conception of Jesus and that the idea of the Holy Spirit is rarely found; also, when found, the idea does not warrant the metaphysical interpretation so often put upon it.

The Position of the Synoptic Gospels

In the teaching of Jesus, and in the Synoptic Gospels generally, God is thought of as the loving Father, so near that there is no need nor room for any intermediary between him and his children. He who *is* Spirit, *the* Spirit, is close at hand—God himself. With the disciples it was really a "duality," the Father and the Son. As a matter of fact, the Pauline and the Johannine conceptions of the Spirit, mentioned in connection with God the Father, and Jesus the Son, are far removed from the fourth-century conception. They are really

only practical working definitions, describing in terms of actual Christian experience the way in which God works in the world. This is also true of the threefold formula of Matt. 28:19, referred to above. Undoubtedly, however, in all these instances the thought is beginning to tend away from the simple, practical significance of the Hebraic and dominant synoptic emphasis.

In spite of these strictures, my sympathies are with historic Trinitarianism rather than with Unitarianism. Certainly any sympathetic religious man who is not a bigot would respond to the general attitude taken by such great Unitarian leaders as Channing and Martineau, but, generally speaking, Unitarianism has interested itself too largely in pointing to the negative side of the question. In insisting, in season and out of season, that Jesus was "a mere man" it has failed, along with many of its opponents also, to recognize the fact that no man is "a mere man," according to genuine Christian teaching. Much less can it be said of such a one as Jesus that he was "a mere man."

This point has already been referred to, but it must be insisted upon because the chief root of present misunderstanding is here. Both extreme conservatives and extreme radicals base their position on the old and mistaken view that human nature is totally different and disconnected from the divine nature. I have pointed out that this view does not accord with ancient Hebrew thought nor with the teaching of Jesus. Neither does it accord with the results of modern psychology. It sprang out of late Jewish and late Platonic developments, through both of which it effected an entrance into Christian thought and became controlling. So long as it persists, so long will men who ought to be together remain separated, because the particular way in which the divinity of Christ is conceived of depends upon this prior position. If there is an absolute gap between human nature and the divine, then the divinity of Christ will be conceived of as a complete, miraculous incarnation, and the tendency will be to run the whole gamut of external authority, infallibility, and miraculous proof. If human nature is recognized as potentially divine, the divinity of Christ will be thought of as such an impartation of divine life, in the realm of the ethical and the religious, as will infallibly draw men to God, if Jesus be truly given the pre-eminence. Thus men's hearts will be turned away from sin and they will be led in the ways of righteousness.

Constructive Value of the Doctrine of the Divinity of Christ

Let me gather together, in conclusion, the positive, constructive elements in the position here taken, lest their full force be diminished through the piecemeal statement necessitated by the previous inevitable argument. Most people inherit their religion with the color of their hair and either do not question it at all or do not, cannot, question fairly. Even those who have been forced to question most, in formulating their religious views, are controlled far more by practical tendencies than by purely intellectual consideration. This is as it should be and as it has ever been. For most of us an intellectual statement is only a buttress for, or a clarification of, a faith already more or less spontaneously ap-

propriated. Still, we may be helped by such a statement because our minds demand it. Religion cannot do without dogma. If a body of religionists should unite on the simple basis of their belief in God, the universal Father, that basis would be a dogmatic basis. What is needed is not the elimination of dogma but its simplification, and also a provision for its continual revivification through the adaptation of its statement to advancing knowledge. Let us, therefore, for entirely practical reasons, put forth an account of the intellectual process by which a modern man, with full recognition of the results of science and of historical criticism, may defend his faith in the divinity of Jesus.

We have a life to live in the midst of a world that is partly, but only partly, intelligible to us. In order to live that life most effectively it is necessary to have some conviction regarding the why of it all, the whence and the whither of things. The facts of existence give us clues which we may follow up far enough to establish reasonable hypotheses, or faiths, by means of which we can govern our action, holding fast the more firmly as experience justifies our faith; discarding or modifying as experience compels us thus to change. One is at liberty, of course, to interpret the universe in terms of the lowest of its elements, provided one is willing to pay the penalty. So, one may fix his faith in atoms, become a materialist, and consider all spiritual forms of life as illusory. It would seem more reasonable, however, to believe that the ultimate nature of an organism is that revealed by its highest manifestations; that which it is capable of producing at its best. If this is true of plants and animals, may we not reasonably assume it to be true of the universe of things, plants, animals, and men? One may easily say that one thinks a stone is as good as a man, but "actions speak louder than words," and therefore we do not have to argue the position that there is an ascending scale of being in the universe from the inanimate, through the merely animate, to the consciousness of man.

Current observation and the study of history both may lead us to the conclusion that, in man, it is not merely intellectual acumen which is significant, but also, still more, what we call character and spiritual appreciation, because the latter, far more than the former, have to do with the direction and employment of man's abilities and with his destiny. Among the various exponents of competing types of character and spiritual appreciation stands Jesus of Nazareth, not merely as a teacher of what is known as the Christian life, but also as a living exemplar of it. It was never easier than now to come to the conclusion that in Jesus—not in his teaching merely, but in himself, in his person—we have the highest personal manifestation of spiritual life that the world has yet seen. This conclusion may be reached not only through the direct response the life of Jesus calls forth, but also by considering the age-long and ever-increasing command it has exercised over the hearts of men—a command which, in these latter days even more than at earlier times, is overleaping geographical, political, and racial boundaries and is exerting its benign influence on man as man.

What can we say, then, about a universe which has produced this wonderful

phenomenon? What must we say? Are not we justified in holding that the essential nature of the organism is best revealed in this, its finest flower? Are we not compelled to say that such things are not due to chance? If not chance, then what? At this point should we not bend the knee and recognize our God? And must it not be that such a God is essentially of the same spirit and purpose as the life through which we come to a belief in him? In other words, must not our God be like Jesus of Nazareth? He cannot be inferior to him and remain God; nor can we easily imagine a quality of life superior to that of Jesus. Thus the usual form of the problem is reversed. The modern question is not, "Is Jesus like God?" but rather, "Is there a God of the same quality of life as that possessed by Jesus?" God is the x, the unknown quantity which we are seeking to determine, and it seems most reasonable to hold that Jesus is the known factor through which we are enabled to solve the problem.

If all this is true, or in general accordance with the truth, then we are ready to use with intelligence, discrimination, and yet with whole-hearted self-commitment, many of the time-worn terms that have been hallowed by Christian usage. Especially may it be said that the language of the New Testament serves to express fittingly our proper appreciation of, and our attitude toward, Jesus of Nazareth. We may call him Messiah, the Christ, the Son of God, the Revealer, the Savior, Lord, and Master. In his varied functions he will be to us Prophet, Priest, and King. Nothing will be too high or too lofty to express our faith in him, our trustful attitude toward him, or our recognition of his supreme and final place in the drama of life portrayed before our half-blind eyes upon the wondrous stage of God's great universe.

A CORRECTION

In the article by Professor William Adams Brown in the April number of the *Biblical World*, p. 230, lines 32 and 33, there was an error due to the failure to make corrections which Professor Brown had marked in the galley proof of his article. The sentence reads: "We are trying not to save individual drunkards and prostitutes but simply to create," etc. It should read: "We are trying not simply to save individual drunkards and prostitutes but to create such a social order," etc.

A CONVERSATION THAT MIGHT HAVE OCCURRED BETWEEN DR. WILLIAM CAREY AND THE REV. ADONIRAM JUDSON, SERAMPORE, INDIA, SEPTEMBER, 1812

A. K. PARKER, D.D.
Professorial Lecturer on Modern Missions, University of Chicago

In this "Imaginary Conversation" many phrases attributed to Dr. Carey or to Mr. Judson have been borrowed from their journals and letters. The denominational controversy to which allusion is made is now happily a thing of the past, but the differences between Congregationalists and Baptists must have been much in Mr. Judson's mind a hundred years ago, and were a source, no doubt, of keen distress. It will be remembered, however, that on his visit to America in 1845 he received a most cordial welcome from the churches with which he had been formerly in communion.

CAREY: This little building to which our walk has brought us, Brother Judson, was once a heathen temple. Forsaken, long ago, by the votaries of its ugly little black idol, it has since been set apart to Christian uses. Here Church of England chaplains and brethren of the London Missionary Society have frequently met with my Serampore associates and myself to recommend brethren to the work of the Lord in various portions of this great field. No such union of heart between different denominations exists in England.

JUDSON: No, nor in America.

CAREY: Let us rest awhile in this cool shade. Under this roof the sainted Henry Martyn lodged for a time. In the cool of the day he used to kneel on this open platform, overlooking the river, and pour out his soul in agonizing prayer for India's idolatrous millions. Here, six years ago, the brethren with fervent supplication committed him to the Divine mercies on the eve of his departure for Dinajpur. We call it since "Henry Martyn's pagoda." You will not wonder that it is to us all a hallowed spot.

JUDSON: I thank you with all my heart for bringing me here. God grant that many other shrines, now given over to the abominations of the heathen, may speedily thus be purified and redeemed! But tell me, Dr. Carey, are there signs discernible today that India is well-nigh ready to turn from idols to the living God?

CAREY: First, my brother, let me beg you no longer in addressing me to use the title you have just employed. I appreciate deeply the honor my brethren in America have done me in conferring this degree. It would not be courteous to refuse it, but I would not be continually reminded of their partial estimate of my services to the Redeemer's kingdom. I am plain William Carey, saved by grace, no worthier or more

honorable now in Serampore than when I cobbled shoes in Moulton.

But now as to your question. It is certain that many more people care for the gospel in India today than twenty years ago. The Lord is doing great things in Calcutta, to my personal knowledge. Open profanity and Sabbath-breaking are much abated. In the highest circles, religion is a common theme of conversation. Many family altars have been set up. More than thirty ministers of the gospel are witnessing for Christ in India today.

JUDSON: But you are speaking, are you not, of the increased attention given to religion by Europeans?

CAREY: Doubtless. But that increased attention is very cheering. It strengthens the heart of every missionary. There is even reason to think that the inveterate hostility to our enterprise of the honorable East India Company is abating. All these things work mightily, if imperceptibly, upon the heathen heart.

JUDSON: Imperceptibly, my dear sir? But surely there have been heathens, not a few, brought to Christ?

CAREY: Ah, yes. I say it humbly and gratefully, God has signally rewarded our efforts. We should praise him with overflowing hearts for the salvation of a single soul. But the membership of our churches numbers more than three hundred. And although not all of them, as sad inconsistencies and lapses testify, are really rooted and grounded in the faith, we have much assurance of the prevalence of a genuine love for the Redeemer. They have thrown off the hateful bondage of caste, they trample upon their idols, they keep the Sabbath day, they appear to love the Word. Yes, these New Testament churches of baptized believers are a precious witness that God honors our work.

JUDSON: And yet—

CAREY: Pardon my interruption, my son. I surmise your disappointment. And I sympathize with it. You are saying to yourself that at the end of a score of years the harvest of these ripening fields should have been far more abundant.

JUDSON: Indeed. I confess, since your kindness encourages me to speak frankly, that your account falls somewhat below the expectations with which I left America.

CAREY: That I can well believe. We at Serampore are not unaware that the brethren at home are impatient for large numerical returns, for great ingatherings of redeemed souls. We are even informed that on the part of some of our staunchest supporters there is serious dissatisfaction with the employment of so much of our time in the study, the printing office, the school.

JUDSON: You will not, surely, be offended, my brother, if I admit that I have myself sometimes wondered that while myriads of unsaved souls around you are going into eternity every hour you can be contented with this uneventful routine of translation and of school-teaching. Was it for this that you were commissioned? Forgive me if my words are presumptuous. I have been prone from my youth—I confess it with shame—to an undue confidence in my own opinions.

CAREY: No need to ask forgiveness. Your question is one which I must always gladly entertain. But let us

waive it for a time while you tell me of your own call to this service.

JUDSON: What can I say, my brother, other than previous relations have conveyed to you? Nevertheless, it is a joy to recur to that memorable experience. My thoughts had long been engaged with my duty to foreign missions without reaching a settled conviction. But one day while in meditation and prayer upon this matter in the course of a solitary walk in the woods at Andover, the command of Christ, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," came so forcibly to my mind that since that hour I have had no other purpose in life than to obey it. There were great difficulties in my way. But my resolve has never for a moment been shaken. Brother Carey, I have been called to the work of an evangelist. I must preach the gospel of Christ where he has never yet been named, whether men will hear or whether they will forbear.

CAREY: Your testimony stirs me deeply, my son. And with my whole heart I praise God for the strong assurance you are permitted to entertain that you are a chosen vessel unto the Gentiles.

JUDSON: But was it not so with you?

CAREY: I have always been of a sober, self-distrustful temper, not given to spiritual transports and ecstasies. Doubtless these high privileges are reserved for the saints, for men like Brainerd and Martyn. Nevertheless, a conviction was wrought upon me. How? I cannot tell. It must have come slowly and quietly. But I have sometimes told myself that I should not be here today if I had not read Captain Cook's *Voyages*, and by it had my thoughts turned compassionately to the multitude of dusky island savages who had never heard of the Son of God who came from heaven to save lost sinners. It must have been in those days that I became a missionary. Surely unto me also is this grace given that I may preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ.

JUDSON: Ah, how my heart leaps in response to those words! To proclaim the good news of salvation—in the name of Christ to plead, face to face, with dying men—is it not for this that the missionary is sent forth? Can any duty be more urgent upon him than this?

CAREY: I have but one rule of duty, my son. The immediate duty is always the urgent duty. With us, at Serampore, it is plain that the immediate duty is to give to India the word of God in its vernaculars. Will not the printed page effectually preach Christ and his salvation? And what lasting result shall the most fervent evangelist win, unfurnished with the Bible? Not that we do not ourselves preach persistently and faithfully and, as we are able, qualify and send forth native agents. But a great task is appointed us which we dare not decline. The labor is very great. It demands unflagging industry and an unwearied spirit. It may be that we must yet consecrate to it the toil of many years.

JUDSON: But must we then conclude that the glorious and signal triumphs of the gospel which the church so ardently expects are not for our generation? Will it not be our privilege to behold the idols cast to the bats, and the peoples that sit in darkness turning to the true God?

CAREY: These are mysteries for which I have no key. I only know that

the missionary has need of a faith in the gracious and immovable purposes of God that can outwear the longest and the darkest night. He learns, with whatever expectations he may have left his native shores, that the gospel wins its way among the heathens very slowly. Listen! Even now you may hear from the temple just across the river the horrid din of the abominable worship of devils. Truly, my son, you have come to dwell where Satan's throne is.

JUDSON: But I remember the opinion expressed by Sir William Jones, years ago, that the attachment of both Hindus and Mohammedans to their ancestral systems is lessening every day. And surely he was a learned man, and well acquainted with India.

CAREY: Yes, Sir William Jones was not without opportunities for forming a sound judgment on these matters. And I have myself sometimes thought that there is less prejudice and bigotry among these idolaters than once. But these are opinions. The facts must be faced. We do not yet see the strongholds of the Adversary cast down, and penitent multitudes turning unto the living God.

JUDSON: The more wonderful with every word you speak, dear brother in Christ, appears to me the serene, patient, unflagging routine of toil through which you have already accomplished tasks at which the Christian world marvels and gives thanks to God.

CAREY: Ah, that is little to my credit. My single talent is a very humble one. And yet I strive to magnify it. I can plod. But I have talked far too much of myself. It was in my mind, Brother Judson, when we came out together for this quiet hour, to express to you more fully than I have yet been able to do our deep joy that in loyal obedience to the word of God, you have followed your Lord in the appointed way of baptism and thus have entered into our denominational fellowship.

JUDSON: Little indeed did I dream, when leaving home, that I should arrive at Serampore a convinced Baptist, or that my desire to defend the Paedo-baptist position against your assaults should have brought me over to your point of view.

CAREY: To be sure, you need not have feared our assaults. In any case, we should have made none. Indeed we care less perhaps than we should for the matters in controversy between Baptists and Paedobaptists, so far more important are the concerns which occupy our attention here. It has even been in my heart to wish, though you must not whisper this to your new Baptist correspondents, that all denominational distinctions on the foreign field might be swept away. But these are millennial fancies, and my own household of faith has ever been very dear to me.

JUDSON: Indeed, indeed, the sympathy of my brethren at Serampore is very precious to me. It has been a severe trial to my wife and me to separate ourselves from our friends at home. That, by the step just taken, we have forfeited completely the support promised us is certain when I remember that the missionaries of the Board were definitely instructed to baptize credible believers and their households. Far heavier, however, is the loss of friendships. My wife has been writing recently to a cherished friend in America who will no longer love her, she fears, when she learns that Ann has become a Baptist.

CAREY: But surely you need not apprehend such direful consequences from a mere change of conviction upon denominational questions—questions regarding which good men have always differed.

JUDSON: I do not know how it may be in England but in North America the gulf that divides Congregationalists from Baptists is very wide. Sectarian controversies are bitter. I cannot deceive myself. The news of my immersion will be received in the Congregational churches with keen chagrin.

CAREY: But certainly the Baptists will rally to your support. You may depend upon the active sympathy of my friends and correspondents, Dr. Baldwin of Boston and Dr. Staughton of Philadelphia. There must be many others like-minded with them.

JUDSON: It may be so. Nevertheless, this is a trial hour. Whether the Baptist churches of America will compassionate my situation, I know not. I am personally unknown to them. They may not unreasonably demur to the request that they accept as their missionary agent one trained in the tenets of Congregationalism.

CAREY: Be of good cheer, my brother! Though you walk in darkness today, you are following divine guidance. Expect great things of God! He will not disappoint you. We shall learn by and by, I am assured, in reply to your surprising communication, that the working of the Holy Spirit is manifest in the churches of our faith in America. I foresee that through the trial of your faith the cause of our Redeemer will be greatly strengthened. It is a little thing in itself that you, once a Congregationalist, have become a Baptist. How insignificant a matter is mere denominational aggrandizement to men placed as we are, who wait with prayer to see the church of Christ enlarge the place of her tent and stretch forth the curtains of her habitations.

JUDSON: Your words shame my fears. I will wait on the Lord and take courage. "The Star in the East" again shines brightly before me, and my confidence is renewed that it may yet lead me to Burmah, for whose salvation my heart has greatly longed.

CAREY: It is a land of thick darkness, my son. But of late it has seemed to us not altogether inaccessible to the gospel. The king is not unfriendly. And yet we do not forget that the missionary in Burmah is outside of British protection and at the mercy of an absolute and arbitrary heathen monarch.

JUDSON: Nevertheless, I must ask the brethren at evening worship to make, once more, united supplication for Burmah. I would fain see the way to Burmah opening before me, even though bonds and imprisonment await me there!

PRESENT TENDENCIES IN OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY
Professor of Old Testament Interpretation, Philadelphia Divinity School

Twenty-five years ago in this country the so-called higher criticism was just beginning to filter down into the rank and file of the students of the Hebrew Bible. The name was known only to be feared by the mass of Bible readers. The Pentateuch was still the battlefield in the eyes of the world: even scholarship had not yet awakened to the catastrophic results which must logically affect the whole range of the study of Old Testament Scriptures and religion. The "Wellhausen theory"—so called because that magnificent scholar became the protagonist of the cause through the brilliance of his arguments—was still in dispute, namely as to the point for which his name especially stands, the late, post-exilic composition of the Priest Code, which the first pentateuchal critics had regarded as the backbone and so the earliest element of the five books of Moses. The new archaeology, quickened from Babylonia, had not made its way down into the rank and file of students. It was not so long before that the elder Semitists looked with suspicion upon the claims of the new science, and apart from some outstanding specimens of Babylonian literature, like the Flood and Creation stories, the principal contribution of Assyriology to biblical science lay in the historical field, the texts which gave the names and deeds of the oriental monarchs who had touched the fortunes of Israel. On this side the archaeology of Mesopotamia was claimed by the conservatives as of apologetic value. As for the other oriental realms, the results of Egyptology had been exploited, leaving, however, a sense of disappointment in their application to Israel; William Wright had but a few years before published his prophetic work, *The Empire of the Hittites* (1884), which was received with incredulity; South Arabia had not yet been really opened up; Cretan archaeology, indeed the vast implications of the Mediterranean world, unearthed first by Schliemann, were not suspected by the most daring. As for exegesis, we had the commentaries of superb scholars, like Hitzig, Ewald, Dillmann, masters in the philology and criticism of their day, but who were before the time when archaeology should play the chief rôle and literary criticism should become one of the chief trial factors for criticizing the text of the prophets and poets, while the articulation of Israel's religion into the close-knit fabric of ancient faith and myth had not yet been attempted by the later science of comparative religion. A commentary of a quarter of a century ago was a rich mosaic of precious fragments of learning, but with no discernible pattern: there were still missing the solvents which should analyze and combine and present in their proper proportions and relations

the twisted threads of history and literature.

Such was the state of things, at least in the reminiscences of the writer, twenty-five years ago. I do not mean that the men higher up did not see farther, but only that they were not so sure of results that they could make their light shine down into the profane world. But coming down into a briefer span of time, let us say the past fifteen years, anyone whose critical studies go back for a quarter of a century must feel amazed at the amount of rich fructification that has burst forth in this limited time, all of it founded on the labors of the past, but coming to maturity all at once under the conjunction of many happy influences. There is first of all archaeology, the many bits of whose discoveries have been slowly pieced together, until all at once, as in a picture puzzle, the meaning of a large aggregation suddenly flashes on the mind's eye. There is the larger and deeper appreciation of ancient man, derived both from the study of the primitive races and also from more intelligent appreciation of the ancient literatures like that of Greece, whereby we learn that man then as now, it is to be assumed, thought and spoke simply and clearly within his limited range of ideas; with the application of this principle we have knocked down the barriers of many a corrupt text, have come, with patience, to understand many a phrase or book which formerly appeared only a pious riddle. There has arisen the realization that the study of the texts does not mean a haphazard comparison of manuscripts and versions, but entails an applied and accurate analysis of the materials which may constitute a lifework. In the fierce competition of scholarship it has been discovered that there exists a deep aesthetic character in the Old Testament which requires something more than Philology and the critical scalpel. And then and latest of all there is the accumulation of facts and theories in the study of comparative religion which gives us a place to stand in our judgment of the Old Testament religion, a point which must be continually shifting with the growth of fresh knowledge, so that the young science may not take conceit to itself, although its attempt to explain Israel's religion must be regarded as perfectly reasonable, even if in its investigations it halts before the inscrutable mysteries of the human heart and experience, just as our physics rises to measure the stars but is unable to fathom the eternal depths beyond.

The New Situation in General

Probably the most important feature of the present stage of Old Testament study is that it has been weaned from its old status of a purely theological discipline, necessary for theologians and seminarians alone. Israel's history is found to be part and parcel of the history of the world: the archaeologist, the student of religion, the literary critic has discovered that here is a rich mine of fact and comparison for his own field of labor, and many an outsider has attacked Old Testament problems with his tools and theories to produce results which shame the specialist, while the Old Testament student himself has learned that he may think nothing human alien to himself. He cannot

bask in the Hebrew as "the speech which angels love," he ought to know the gamut of the Semitic languages; he may not be satisfied with the Hebrew text of the Bible, he must explore the recesses of versions of half a dozen different tongues; the history of Israel is not that of Abraham's family developing in a land from which the hornet had happily exterminated every Canaanite, he has to do with a Babel of races and influences; the very religion itself now must be studied under the light of facts from Egypt and Arabia and Babylonia, from Crete and Greece and the Hittites. And in judgment upon the theologian sits the specialist in similar fields beyond who calls him to account for every prejudice and stupid convention of thought. He has to make a science of his subject and articulate it in the science of mankind.

May I be pardoned if I write as though I thought none or few of my readers were conversant with what I speak of? But it means no disrespect to say that probably many intelligent men think that the word "criticism" still means some such thing as once was presented to us under the term "higher criticism," consisting in a very arid division of the text of the Bible into so many different sources, a J and E and P, which position many may have adopted as the complete solution and still stay there, as if there was nothing beyond Wellhausen, while others rejecting that prosiac theory, abhorrent or uninteresting to orthodox or imaginative minds, have been content to remain behind on the older position that "the old Bible is good enough for me." But we may assure ourselves that no such static condition obtains in present-day Old Testament science; the inroad of new facts and theories has thrown all into a most fascinating and perplexing flux. Wellhausen—I use the name typically—no longer stands in the center of the field, though that school has always to be reckoned with. But there are all sorts of new schools abroad to which the older criticism is a commonplace or an archaism, each making the most of its own choice of facts, each jostling the other. I doubt if anywhere there is more confusion, but the present is the most pregnant age in the whole history of Old Testament criticism. Nothing is finished, we are just beginning! There is plenty for everyone to learn and discover, if he keep an open eye and advance with all the scientific training he can bring to bear from whatever quarter.

The Philological Study of Hebrew

In summarizing the manifold activities of Old Testament science, I may only briefly refer to the stimulus given to Hebrew study by the rapid and enormous publication of Assyriological literature, which is assuming a capital interest in Semitic philology much like that which Arabic has hitherto enjoyed. It requires no effort of thought to understand the possibilities for Hebrew study which lie in the language of Babylonia, whose literature is millenniums older than the Bible dialect, and which was the imperial language of southwest Asia. South Arabian archaeology has also opened up a limited but rich mine of philological research. I may refer here briefly to Hommel's *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*. Three dictionaries attest the activities of scholarship in this line:

the so-called *Oxford Dictionary*, edited by Professors Brown and Briggs of Union Seminary and Professor Driver of Oxford; the last edition of the classical Gesenius in German; and yet another by König. And it is to be noticed that the mere study of words still constitutes the substance of many learned treatises and is a necessary basis of every scientific work on the Old Testament.

The Status of Text-Criticism

From philology we pass naturally to the study of the Hebrew text: despite all the labor expended here from the days of the scribes early in our era and of Origen, greatest of Christian scholars, down through the disputes of Protestant and Catholic theologians and the labors of Kennicott and De Rossi, we feel that the work is still only in its inception according to the demand of modern scientific criticism. No such impetus has come to our aid as in the New Testament field, some of whose oldest codices have only been discovered, others for the first time evaluated, within a few decades. No ancient Hebrew texts have been discovered; we still must rely upon manuscripts of the end of the first Christian millennium, although the discovery of two-thirds of the original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus and of a third of the Greek of the Book of Enoch, from which the Ethiopic was translated, keeps us hopeful for textual finds. But at present we are thrown back upon the slow and uncertain process of comparison with the ancient versions, primarily the Greek. Here a work even more laborious than that of New Testament textual criticism must be instituted to discover the genealogical relations of the Greek manuscripts and of the daughter versions; and only when this has been accomplished can we surely proceed to the criticism of the Hebrew text. We have been slow at the work; a start has been made in the collation of the Greek texts in the Cambridge Septuagint edited by Brooke and McLean of which only three fasciculi, covering Genesis to Deuteronomy, have appeared. The Göttingen Academy has instituted a grand undertaking in the field of Septuagintal study and is publishing a series of monographs as prolegomena to the plan. Many sober scholars feel that much of the higher criticism has too rashly gone ahead of the settlement of the text, and decry the easy and ready methods with which the German scholars, especially, handle the text to suit their exegesis. Of course, textual criticism is temperamentally conservative—we may compare the opposition of the English and German schools in New Testament criticism, the former insisting on the textual, the other somewhat impatiently straining after more striking results, although I conceive that now Germany is snatching the laurels from the brows of the English lower critics. An extreme instance of the part which Septuagintal criticism may play or be made to play is seen in the rather noisy work of Mr. Wiener, who from this standpoint has been virulently attacking the Wellhausen school in a series of articles in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, also appearing in two volumes, *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism: The Coup de Grâce to the Wellhausen Critics*, and *The Origin of the Pentateuch: A Complete Answer to the Wellhausen Critics*. It

may be worth while to say that he argues from the disagreement of the Greek with the Hebrew in the use of the divine names in the Pentateuch to the fallacy of arguing from these names to the discrimination of sources. But the argument is itself fallacious, for the higher critic by no means depends upon this criterion, which is rather of historical importance as having first given the impetus to the theory of sources. But this aggressive attack on the prevailing school may be worth noticing to show that positions, however approved and accepted as orthodox, will require continual restatement, and that a mere orthodoxy of criticism cannot maintain itself.

Opposition to the Wellhausen School by Radicals

Passing on now to the domain of higher criticism it may be curtly said that in the Pentateuchal field the so-called Wellhausen school on the whole holds the field victoriously, although as I shall later show, it is no longer the center of interest. The acceptance of those tenets is by no means a brand of intellectual or religious radicalism, as it once was: in Germany conservatives like Kautzsch, Kittel, König, in England men like Driver and Skinner, profess this school. In fact English and American scholarship is found almost entirely in the Wellhausen camp, outside of a few confessional strongholds.

However voices are heard from radical camps in opposition to this school of criticism. A Dutch scholar, Eerdmans, is publishing a series of books to prove the impracticability of the Wellhausen source-theory, though it must be recognized, in order to establish another source-theory of his own, that the use of the word "Elohim" represents a polytheistic stratum—a result hardly consoling to the old-fashioned conservative.[1] But from another quarter there has appeared an aggressive and often contemptuously expressed criticism of the Wellhausenites. I refer to that younger school of Assyriologists called pan-Babylonists—nor do they refuse the title—who claim everything in sight for Babylon. They are impatient with the negative results of this higher criticism for historical study. When we have assigned the compiled sources to certain ages before or after the Exile, there still remains the question as to the historical value of their contents, however early or late composed in their present form. Sayce has pointed out that characteristic elements both of the Yahwist, the eldest source, and of the Priest Code, the youngest, are found equally in the Babylonian parallel to the biblical Flood story. According to the Priest Code alone Abraham's family came from Ur of the Chaldees in Southern Babylonia; the higher critic dismisses the story as a late fabrication, although not by logical necessity. But the Babylonist sees in it a historical illustration of the movement of the Semitic races about 2000 B.C., and claims Abraham as the evangelist to the westland of the esoteric monotheism, which, he asserts, had its rise in the Babylonian schools back toward 3000 B.C. A fascinating presentation of this school's theories can now be had in English translation in

[1] An article soon to appear in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* from the hand of Professor Schmidt, of Cornell, will illustrate this phase of criticism.

Jeremias' *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient Orient.*[1]

The Analysis of J, E, and P

This school, opinionated and arbitrary as it is, with almost a cult of its own, rejected by soberer scholars for the lack of proof for its stupendous claims, is nevertheless again a healthy leaven to forestall any settling of the lees on the part of the higher criticism. Of more solid importance, however, is the criticism which, stacking on the Wellhausen hypothesis, is criticizing the contents of the several sources of the Pentateuch. J, E, and P, the symbols of the several strata, are no longer found adequate; each of them is to be subdivided into so many hands or cycles of tradition, or even fragments. In the first eleven chapters of Genesis Budde distinguishes three or four J's. This internal criticism is leading us back to early strata of literature and legend, and the elder tendency of criticism to bring down the dates of the sources is being reversed in favor of early dates for the sub-sources. The traditional extreme of the Mosaic composition of the Pentateuch will never be reached again, but criticism, instead of pulling down, now thinks it will be able to recover fragments of literature or saga which go back to the Mosaic age. Of course this process with its eructation of many hands is exposed to the danger of very a priori opinion, and there arises the impression that the higher criticism is going bankrupt, in somewhat the same way that we must feel in the matter of the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels. When in either field will the process ever stop and come to certainty? Still, it is better to know the uncertainty of one's position than to be confident on shifting sands. In this connection I may point to the *Polychrome Bible*, edited in this country, as an undertaking on a large scale to present the results of source criticism; the work remains unfinished for lack of funds.

The Case of the Prophetical Books

But the Pentateuch is no longer the sole field of the higher criticism. The analysis has been carried on rigorously through the historical books, but its field of special activity just now is the Prophets. At this point—I must speak summarily—there reigns entire confusion. With one school there prevails the theory that practically each prophetic book is a jumble of fragments from every quarter and that every passage must prove its title to authenticity. The absence of historical data in so large part of these prophetical books, and the marked contradictions of opinion as to the historical development of Israel's religion, invite every reconstructor of the prophets to the exploitation of the most subjective criticism. The radicals seem to know very well what the prophets could not have spoken, and eliminate huge sections; according to Duhm, only one-eighth of Jeremiah comes from the prophet of that name; according to Haupt only one chapter of Micah is authentic. Not only so but they rewrite the fragments that remain and assume to tell us what the prophets must have said. Examples of this literary recomposition of the Prophets can be seen *in extenso* in the work of the same

[1] Compare Toy's criticism of the school in *Harvard Theological Review*, III.

Baltimore scholar, Haupt, in numerous articles in American learned journals. The post-exilic hypothesis is especially active in this field; I am inclined to think that by far the major portion of the "pre-exilic" Prophets has been transferred by the radicals to the age after the Exile, and of this again a very large portion to the Maccabaean period. We have to recognize that the pentateuchal critical principles are being applied to the Prophets; it is a stage of unrest and arbitrariness, upon which must follow a reaction; and indeed the reaction has already set in.

Metrical Criticism

Before I leave the internal criticism of the Old Testament I should notice one new species of analysis which has fast forged to the front in the past twenty years, the so-called metrical criticism, which, based on the recognition of the formally poetical character of a large part of the Testament, attempts to recover the original poetic form, to state its laws, and to revise the text where it appears to transgress the ascertained canons of meter. Some of the principles, especially the rhetorical characteristics of Hebrew prosody, were discovered by Bishop Lowth over one hundred and fifty years ago, but it has remained for scholars, many of whom are still alive, Briggs in this country, Budde and Duhm and others in Germany, to establish the principles of musical form. A capital little book of W. H. Cobb's, *Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre*, would serve as a good introduction. In this country we are most familiar with Briggs's essays in this direction, but while he has been a pioneer of merit, his aesthetic powers have not been sufficient to make the cause appeal to English readers as it should. The more poetical German temperament has done the best work. One of the best essays in English in the reproduction in English form of the Hebrew poetry is found in Schmidt's *Messages of the Poets*.

The sense for this form of criticism and enjoyment of it are in the aesthetic perceptions, and ultimately we may look for a tremendous increase in the appreciation of the Old Testament when the layman shall have in his hands adequate poetical translations of the biblical poetical books. Further, this criticism is pregnant with exegetical value, for the canons of poetry are different from those of prose. Again, it possesses an objective, I might say a mechanical, value of very great importance, which is already being rigorously and drastically applied. The text is being rewritten to suit the assumed principles of prosody, and this critical art is being used as a reagent to test the higher critical problems of authorship. To give one example: Duhm rejects seven-eighths of Jeremiah on the ground of his asserted discovery that the prophet wrote only in a certain meter, the tetrameter. This is an extreme instance of the tendency, but the Prophets and Poets can never again be expounded without the fullest recognition of the claims of poetical criticism. Even such a book as Genesis is now claimed by Sievers, the most distinguished authority in the world on the science of metrics, as of clearly marked poetical structure; but his claim is not corroborated by the Hebraists.

The Progress of Archaeological Study of the Old Testament

I pass now to the tendencies induced by archaeology in Old Testament study. The rapid development in the decipherment and interpretation of the records of the ancient East has been the profoundest as well as the most striking influence upon this field for the past generation and more. It is important enough to demand a whole paper, not to be confined to a paragraph. But fortunately I can retrench on the subject because all intelligent students are familiar with the great outstanding results of archaeology. As to their inferences there still rages animated, even fierce, discussion, and I may not enter into the problems. Suffice it to say that we are not here presented with the simple dilemma often naïvely offered: Does archaeology prove or disprove the Bible, despite the zeal "not according to knowledge" of many writers of popular books? But in general it may be asserted that archaeology is exercising a sobering, conservative influence in biblical science. It offers outward, objective facts to counteract the necessarily subjective and largely uncontrolled judgment of literary documents from within, where hypotheses must be maintained for long without corresponding effective proof. Moreover the archaeologist is essentially of a constructive temperament, for he wishes to make as much as possible out of his scanty materials; on the other hand the literary critic is first of all analytical and too often feels that his work is done when he has torn to pieces. There are many archaeologists who take little or no heed of the technical higher criticism, it is not congenial to their mental processes, they are too busily employed in displaying fresh facts to concern themselves over hackneyed discussions. This very application of a new unbiased objective criterion and of a different order of research is an infinite blessing to a science which was threatening to turn in upon itself and enter the stage of dry rot. Indeed it is psychologically interesting to observe how oppositely the same mind may work according as it operates in one or the other field. Thus Hugo Winckler,[1] the leader of the younger school of Assyriologists, has performed some of the most radical critical operations upon the Hebrew literature; but as archaeologist he stands forth as a costumer in the garb of history of much that was relegated to the dust heap of legend. To him Abraham is the evangelist in the westland of the Babylonian monotheism, Israel is a precipitate of the Babylonian culture, Jonah found a congenial field in preaching in Nineveh the doctrine of the one righteous God.

Others like Hommel have entered the fray under the aegis of archaeology, without any religious bias, and are girding with might and main at the, to them, comparatively unassured results of the higher criticism. At least our field is being attacked from a fresh and independent quarter, and the movement is salutary. We may compare the refreshment that has come to New Testament science at the hands of Blass and Ramsay and Deissmann.

[1] This brilliant scholar died April 19, 1913, at the age of 50 years.

New Light on the Mosaic Age

I might signalize the effect of this archaeological quickening in that stage of the history which is always the most interesting, although perhaps not the most profitable, namely, the Mosaic age and the antecedent traditions. Two discoveries have entirely altered our outlook and comprehension of that early age: the Tell el-Amarna tablets (discovered in 1888, first publication in 1892), and the Code of Hammurabi (1899). The former documents have given us a picture of conditions in Palestine in the middle of the second millennium hardly excelled at any point by the Bible records: the latter an apprehension of the surprising ethical and juridical advance of Babylonian civilization in the age of Abraham. Many other items have fallen into the outlines of our skeleton picture, and it may be said that Moses has come to his own as the grand man of Israel's history, a veritable founder of a religion; that the Exodus is historical; that some of the codes in the second book of the Pentateuch may be essentially Mosaic, while the latest treatment, that of Gressmann's *Mose u. seine Zeit*, claims the Decalogue as Moses' work. Some rather radical scholars have been almost stumbling over themselves to establish identifications; Sinai is no longer a myth, although we must locate it, with the same name, in the volcanic region of northwest Arabia; Moses' reputed monotheism is nothing strange, he could have cribbed it from the Babylonian celestial henotheism or from the Egyptian Akenaten's attempt at a monotheistic reform—the first monotheist in history, as Breasted calls him. Now observe that the way these results are worked out and a large part of the results will by no means satisfy the mere conservative, for sometimes they are very shocking. But if one compares Wellhausen's few words on the history of this period in his classic study of Israel's history in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Brittannica* with the positive progress since made, he will recognize that there now exist a feeling of certainty and a will to construct which are new.

Of course we never know what to expect from the spade; it is best to keep from betting on this sport. The recent finds, since 1904, at Elephantine in Upper Egypt, exhibit to us about the end of the fifth century a very lively Jewish colony at that end of the earth, with its independent Yahweh temple, to which they are most loyally devoted, yet worshiping along with him two associate deities—a regular trinity; withal they maintain some kind of fellowship with the Jerusalem Jews. The principles of the Deuteronomic reform are blankly denied, yet withal we have in these papyri some most startling corroborations of many an assertion in Jewish history which had been regarded as apocryphal. It were well if we regarded archaeology with a sincere eye as the handmaid, not so much of religious orthodoxy or scientific prepossession, but of the truth.

The Religio-Historical School

There remains finally one development, the newest, the most promising, on which I may say but a few words, for lack of time and also for the difficulty of exposition. It is what the Germans

call the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, the school which applies the criteria used in the general investigation of tradition, legend, myth, religious rites, and beliefs, so as to discover the historical import of these things. It is a child of that science which is recovering, on the basis of archaeology and rites and myths, the history of ancient Greece and Rome. The school differs from that of the higher critics in professing the requirement of imagination. It is actuated by the same temperament as that inspiring work, Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to Greek Religion*, which so wonderfully revivifies and interprets the faith of the ancient Greeks. And even if her work or theirs proves fallacious, nevertheless they have given us a spur and a clue to the reconstruction of ancient history to which mere literary scalpels are never adequate.

The school is most catholic in its use of tools; it employs the whole of archaeology from whatsoever field, it is based on the higher criticism, does not hesitate to outdo the older criticism in its analysis of texts; without fear of its own rashness it ventures to analyze the different phases of Israel's traditions and thought, to peel them off layer by layer, so as to uncover the historical residuum, at the same time utilizing every layer as an exponent of the growth of the people's thought in the several ages.

This tendency has not yet infected the sober Anglo-Saxon genius; we must go to the Germans for it, although the Scot, Robertson Smith, is one of its forerunners. Leaving to one side the haphazard methods of the pan-Babylonists, I suppose that the protagonist of this school is Gunkel, with his *Commentary on Genesis* (1901), now in the third edition, and the name suggests a delightful little book of his on the Psalms, in which he works out to most conservative results in chronology, in a field where it has become almost heterodox to allow preexilic compositions. The great historian of ancient universal history, Eduard Meyer, in his *Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme*, has produced a very skeptical work, but one which shows how the trained student in legend and myth nevertheless knows how to find solid ground. And two books of Gressmann's are or will be peculiarly stimulating: *Der Ursprung d. israelitish-judischen Eschatologie* (1905) and *Mose u. seine Zeit*, which has just appeared, and which promises to be epoch-making.

Let me speak of just two historical principles which such scholars as these are asserting. One is that saga, legend, even myth, are by no means empty to him who will see their historical contents. In his latest work Gressmann spends about two-thirds of the book in analyzing the legends about Moses, but he is confident that by the same process he can come to ultimate historic fact; for him myth is not a red herring laid across the trail but just the accretion of protecting bark which has arisen about the precious germ to hold it for future ages. And so he dares to give us a Moses *redivivus* and to recover the characteristics of his religion and work. The scholar who has gone farthest in the analysis of legend reaches a perfect confidence as to the object of his researches. For him the various phases of the literature of the folk-mind stand for ultimate facts which can be reached by scientific processes.

The other historic principle vindicated by this school is that we dare not think that an idea necessarily arose first with the first literary attestation of it. I may here refer to the other book of Gressmann's on Israelite eschatology. (The English reader can obtain some idea of his thought and methods in a paper of his entitled "Sources of Israel's Messianic Hope," in the *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1913.) He shows how the eschatological references of the prophets, instead of being brand new in origin, presuppose a long development of theological thought among the people; when they spoke of the Day of the Lord, or the Messiah, or of salvation, or a new heaven and a new earth, they were speaking to almost what we would call dogmas. And he buttresses his argument by appeal to similar ideas in the ancient religions of Egypt and Babylonia. He thus entirely reverses the tendency hitherto prevailing which would make Jewish eschatology a product of the post-exilic age, so that for instance the famous Messianic prophecies of Isaiah 9 and 11 must belong to the latest developments of Jewish thought, akin to the apocalyptism of the second century. To give one example, he maintains that the *crux interpretum*, Isa. 7:14, the Immanuel passage, actually declares a wondrous birth, not unlikely the virginal conception, of a wondrous child, and this when exegetes had pretty well settled down to a very prosaic interpretation of the woman in question as any young woman and not a virgin at all. Of course he supposes a widespread mythological notion of a coming deliverer, and it is questionable how far the new view can be used for Christian apologetic. In like manner Gunkel would defend the old reading of Ps. 45:6: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," only understanding it as the courtly address to a prince. Without doubt, this school will give the impression of a reversion to conservative results; substantially it helps inaugurate a period of construction, of a congenial reading one's self into the mind of the past, even if the way is cleared by dynamite.

To conclude, we may note with delight that Old Testament criticism is no longer a "dismal science," but an increasingly fascinating study, full of growth and change.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH FEDERATION

III. ALLIANCES NEEDFUL FOR THE LOCAL CHURCH

A. W. ANTHONY

Chairman of Commission on State and Local Federation, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America

We have said a great deal about "the New Testament church." In the mind of Jesus it did not appear to bulk large, at least in name. He did not describe it; he set forth none of its characteristics as it now exists in modern forms. It would be difficult to read into any of the New Testament passages a description of any one of the churches of the present time with which we are familiar. Jesus spoke of "the kingdom" and "the kingdom of God," and described a renewed and a reformed society; but he "organized" nothing.

Discipleship and Service

Jesus left behind no "model" constitution and by-laws; he held no "church meeting," presided over by a moderator, aided by a secretary and committees. Only twice is the word "church" (or *ecclesia*) laid upon his lips, and then, apparently, in none of our modern uses of the word. Christian community, or Christian society, or even the collective plural, Christians, would seem to correspond to his thought when he says (Matt. 18:17), "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican," for later, in the same immediate connection, he adds, "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (vs. 20), as though the assembly, voluntary in character, without roll-call or formal organization, was characterized only by his "name" and then by his presence.

To explain and defend the meaning of the word "church" in Matt. 16:18 might open the flood-gates of discussion and debate: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This at least, however, can be said without controversy, that the tenses of the verbs are future and the declarations are not descriptive of facts existing at the time of utterance, but are prophetic, so that at the time there was no objective church, actually existing, to which we may look for an understanding of the church's bounds and functions.

Were we to read the Gospel of Mark, or Luke, or John, we should never know that the name "church," or the thought of "a church" had ever been in the mind of Jesus.

No man has yet fathomed the depths of that wondrously transparent and simple mind. It has been the study of the centuries; it is the problem of scholars still. Yet one is safe in saying that two great conceptions constantly dominated the thoughts of Jesus and determined and directed his activities; these

may be expressed in the two words "discipleship" and "service." He called men to himself; gracious invitations breathed from his presence; his movements and his gestures suggested approach; his eyes appeared to express a welcome. Throngs followed him; women and children were not afraid; the sinful and the despised found in him a friend; the leprous and the loathsome were not turned away. And as men came unto his physical presence, then he taught them the principles of his life and revealed unto them the thoughts and purposes of God, in order that they might follow him in a spiritual sense. He was the light of the world; he was the great teacher; he was the way and the truth and the life. He wanted men to be his disciples. This seems to have been his wish for all the world. This is an expression of fellowship, divine fellowship.

But men were not to follow him as a simple pastime nor for mere selfish advantage; they were to follow him in order to serve others. He came himself for ministry; that was the end and object of his career. All his preparation, all his words, all his acts, all his sacrifices were for the sake of others. He laid down his life for the world, as, in response to the love of God for the world, he had come into the world. To serve and to save the world was the goal of his desires. His followers must serve others, exemplifying the fellowship of suffering and of service.

A New Test of Orthodoxy

These great characteristics of Jesus, unattained as yet by his followers, are the real notes of a church. Though the church be housed in a richly ornamented gothic temple, though its membership be composed of the most cultured and influential citizens of a town or commonwealth, though its orthodoxy and zeal be the theme of the fireside and the press, though its pulpit speak with the tongue of men and of angels, yet if it fails to reach out unto Jesus Christ as its ideal, and if it seeks only to maintain its own comfortable existence, it may be but a social club of respectable folks, a society for intellectual and ethical nurture, "sounding brass and a clanging cymbal," or little better than that which Paul calls "nothing."

Whatever may be our opinion of the New Testament conception of the church, whether of baptized or unbaptized members, whether of adults only or of children as well, whether organized congregationally, presbyterianly, episcopally, or papally, whether a local group of believers within a city or composed of all of the believers within a city, whether existing as branches of some mother-church elsewhere or independent of Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria, whatever may be our understanding of the origin and development of the church, we must acknowledge that *that* is not a church which merely has a name and an organization within a consecrated edifice; it must have the marks of discipleship and ministry, it must look up unto Jesus as its ideal for comprehension and imitation, it must look out unto men and so love the world of men, irrespective of race, place, station, or condition, as to seek their welfare and evangelization.

These marks give a new test of orthodoxy and efficiency. In many instances

modifications should be made of our theories of church independency and autonomy. If a local church is not large enough to translate and publish the Scriptures and to print and circulate tracts, when these are needed for service to men, then the local church is incomplete as a church and not fully and fairly worthy of the title of church; if the local church cannot by itself establish and maintain schools and colleges for the education of men in imitation of the great Teacher, quickening and developing the human mind, then the local church is incomplete as a church and needs the fellowship of other churches in order to fill out the churchly conception; if the local church cannot of itself send forth and maintain missionaries at home and abroad, then, provided these missionary functions of the church are a part of the thought of Christ for the church, the local church is not a church, strictly speaking, for more than it can possess alone is required to make up its deficiencies and fill out its gaps. The church to be a church must at least aim at and approximate the ideal set for it by Jesus Christ.

Completeness through Alliances

If what we have hitherto called the church is imperfect and incomplete in the direction of its ideals and aims, have we not had an erroneous idea of the church? Have we not mistaken a fragment for the whole? The whole must possess and exercise the functions of the whole. If the part cannot, then the part is not a unit. This may be but another way of saying that size and ability are tests of ecclesiastical values. At least, we must acknowledge that if numerical littleness involves the loss of essential qualities, then numbers and bigness, at least to the degree of efficiency, are indispensable to a church. This may not mean that that which we now term a church, consisting of but twenty or forty members on the countryside, must disband, or must count itself as excommunicated or in any measure unchurched; but rather, with all due recognition of its inabilities in certain directions, it should regard itself with meekness, and should seek the fellowship of the larger brotherhood in the prosecution of the plans of the kingdom. The little church should at least realize that it has not full right or title to the name of a church, unless it co-operates with other churches in the missionary enterprises of the kingdom. It must put itself into those relations with others which will enable it to perform the full functions of the church. If the big church can be missionary by itself, it must be missionary in order to be a Christian church. If the little church cannot maintain missionary enterprises by itself, it must then combine with others; and the denominational organizations and missionary boards are necessary for the realization of its highest powers. They are not, then, to be regarded as outside of and extraneous to the church—by some fortuitous chance of history grafted upon the church, or attached as parasites; they are essential to the very existence of the church itself; they are co-ordinate parts of a whole.

In some places the church has been subjected to severe criticism, as having lost its vitality and even its right to be. We have been told that men have hissed

the church, although they have cheered the name of Christ. If the criticism is ever just, even in part, the reason, doubtless, is to be found in the fact that the church has struggled for self-preservation; isolated and alone, it has given the impression to men that it had departed from the standards of Jesus Christ, that it was no longer in the path of faithful discipleship and was not striving above all else to do good unto others, but, instead, was seeking its own special privileges and advantages, and in some selfish way aimed only at the good of those who "belonged to the order." Concentration of thought and effort upon self, whether of an individual or of an organization, is worthy only of reproach and reproof. Selfishness is selfishness, wherever found; it does not escape notice, nor fail of opprobrium. Though organized under a constitution, it remains the same, and sacred names do not long disguise it.

No better *apologia* can be written by a church than can be wrought into faithful discipleship and generous service unto others. These can be its complete science of apologetics; and there probably is no other. When a church is losing itself in promoting the welfare of the community in which it is placed, and is raising the level of its environment—when it is concerned with the needs and the woes, the sufferings and the ignorance of men, whether near or far—it is recognized as a body with a more than human life energizing and actuating it, the divine spirit becomes manifest in it, and men turn to it with respect and admiration.

The little church must serve others, or suffer condemnation at the bar of common opinion. "But how can it serve others," someone asks, "when it cannot even take care of itself?" It must federate, is the answer; it must combine and co-operate with others—with its own denomination, first, in the enterprises too large for the little group alone to administer, and then with churches of other orders for the expression of that life which may not otherwise be possible.

Federation is not a mere device for fellowship, however pleasant and at times inspiring that may be, nor for efficiency alone, although that makes all the difference in many instances between success and failure; but is the absolute essential for completeness in the aims and the functions of the church, and without some kind of combination, either in those forms which bear the stamp of denominational organization, or in these newer forms which run across denominational lines, it has been proven in the past that most churches unassociated with others attain but a part of their own life and fail among men to express that message of the life of Christ for which they exist.

Within the Church Itself

The local church itself is a combination of various convictions, experiences, and attainments. No two persons are exactly alike. No one compromises his conscience or his faith by expressing fellowship with another. The lack of conformity, even when conformity is insisted upon, would be amusing, were men disposed to see the humor in their sacred professions. Independent persons cannot flatly agree. Even imitation is a failure, for it cannot be exact.

Fools differ, as well as wise men. Creeds and subscription to creeds have never produced an exactly homogeneous church; and yet in some places men go on making creeds—which is all right, as an intellectual exercise in definition; and in requiring subscription to creeds—which is all wrong, because contrary to the Protestant doctrine of "the right of private judgment," professed by those who defy it in presenting the creed for subscription.

That first church ever assembled, composed of the twelve men who gathered about our Lord, presented probably as great a variety in personal qualities and formulated convictions as exist today, or ever have existed, in the churches and the sects of the earth. We know some of them well enough to be quite sure of their prevailing characteristics. There was Peter, impulsive, emotional, whose utterance and action invariably preceded thought. No modern Christian, however emotional, out-Peters Peter. Then there was Thomas, the investigator, rationalist, and higher critic of the very first order: "Give me evidence, concrete, tangible, positive; let me see, let me handle; or I will not believe." No ancient or modern scholar has gone farther; few have gone so far. John, reticent, mystical, contemplative, a philosopher, presents a very different type, and Philip, whose quick calculation of the amount of bread necessary for a partial supply of the needs of five thousand men marks him as a man of affairs, practical, active, concrete, is of a yet widely different class. These, however, were assembled by the Lord; they were his apostolic college. They were not required to conform to each other's standards, or even to an arbitrary standard set by the Master. They were in fellowship in spite of differences, and by reason of differences the better caught and exemplified the spirit of the Master.

Every denomination has its "right wing" and its "left wing"; every church has its progressives and its conservatives, at least it has those who look for change and are ready for improvement and it has those who are averse to all change and think things are best let alone. These wings and these varying persons, oftentimes groups and parties, should not break apart; they belong together in fellowship; each is needed by the other; all together express the mind of Christ for men in his fellowship and service better than they could apart. They must federate; in their one organization they are federated; remaining together and co-operating they express the spirit and principles of federation in the local church, the same spirit and principles which our Lord expressed when he called together his apostles.

Within a single denomination, and frequently within a single church, are wider gaps between individuals and greater differences in understanding and in conviction than exist between the credal statements, or what may be called the center of gravity, or the average conviction, of denominations. Denominations are no longer homogeneous—perhaps they never were; now we know they are not. And it is their glory; better then do they express the spirit of Christ.

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON
Principal of the University of Chicago High School

Study XIII. Courtesy and Respect

Social custom prescribes certain forms of courtesy in our dealings with each other, conformity with which is supposed to mark the well-bred person. Many of these have their source in the remote past and we perform them without thought of their origin or significance. These forms sometimes have been found to interfere with other more important things and have been set aside. On one occasion when Jesus sent his disciples to visit the cities to which he intended to go, he directed them to "salute no man by the way" (Luke 10:4). He did not intend this to teach them to be discourteous. The form of salutation in the Orient was so elaborate that the time required for it would have prevented them from carrying out the purpose of their journey. For a long time the Chinese would not allow the building of railroads because of respect for their ancestors, over whose graves it would have been necessary for the roads to pass. The outward forms of courtesy are constantly changing. This is not to be regretted so long as the spirit which prompts them remains. Can you give any illustration of such change?

Courtesy has as its basis respect for the worth of another person or of one's self. The Chinese philosopher Confucius, whose teachings contain many valuable precepts regarding courtesy, said, "A man must first respect himself, then others will respect him." You may be sorry for a drunken man, but you do not respect him. A vulgar or profane person has not our respect. Why is this?

Custom has defined certain forms of courtesy in the conduct of men toward women. These reached their height in the courts of kings at the times of which Scott's novels give us a picture. Cite some illustrations. Are men less courteous now? Why does a man lift his hat when meeting a lady? Does a gentleman give his seat to a lady in a crowded car? Does it make any difference whether she is an acquaintance? Discuss the rule of the sea—"women first"—in case of the sinking of the "Titanic." Is the granting of the suffrage to women likely to make any difference in these forms of courtesy toward women? If so, why should it?

In all times children have been regarded as under obligation to show respect to their parents. What is the ground for this? We often hear it said that the youth of today are less respectful toward their parents than in former times. If this is true, to what may it be due? "Children should be seen and not heard" was a familiar saying when

your father was a boy, which is seldom heard now. What is the effect of the present lack of formal restraint in the home upon the attitude of children toward their parents? Is a boy likely to respect his father less if their relations toward each other become those of chums? In many families today the boys have opportunities for better education than their parents had. Should this lessen the respect which a boy has for his father?

Does the position which a teacher holds entitle him to the respect of his pupil? In school, corporal punishment has been given up. What effect do you think this has had in the respect which boys feel for and show their teachers? What qualities in a teacher increase your respect for him? What qualities detract from it?

There is in this country much disrespect for law. Give some illustrations of this. What seems to be the cause? What bad results follow disregard for law? What remedies can you suggest?

Topics for further discussion: The effect of uniforms and costumes as an aid to respect; e.g., those worn by foreign diplomats as contrasted with the black frock coat of one of our foreign representatives; the difference in the attitude of all Englishmen toward their king, and that of all Americans toward the President; the change in the method of dress of clergymen and its effect upon the attitude of people toward them.

Study XIV. Self-Control

One who lives near a harbor is accustomed to see three kinds of craft. The scow has no power of self-propulsion or self-direction. It is useful for carrying cargoes but only within short distances and when towed by a tug. The sailboat makes its way without a tug, but its power is not within itself. Only when the wind blows can it move at all and its progress then depends upon the force and direction of the wind. The steamer has within itself the power which drives it over the seas in any direction in spite of opposing winds and waves. Three kinds of people may be compared with these different craft. Describe each. Does the class in which a man falls depend upon his occupation or social position? Our lives are made up of a succession of choices. On a given morning a boy may go to school or "play hooky"; when asked by his teacher whether he has committed a certain misdemeanor, he may lie or tell the truth. In the ordinary routine, most of our conduct is the result of habit or custom, but in any given situation we may, if we choose, decide to act contrary to these. Does the knowledge that the effects of alcohol are injurious prevent a man from becoming a drunkard? Knowledge is valuable so far as conduct is concerned only as it forms a guide for reasonable choice. The value of the studies of various habits which we have made will depend upon the choice which we make when we are confronted with an opportunity to do a right or wrong act.

The very center of a man, that which determines his strength and power, is his will. The power to exercise his will, to control his conduct, we call self-control. Nothing is so essential to

success as this. A strong body and good health are not so essential. Much of the important work of the world has been done to an accompaniment of pain. How does Robert Louis Stevenson's life illustrate this? Boys are often ready with petty excuses for their failures. Such boys are thus paving the way to failure in life. There is no place on the football team for the boy who shows a "yellow streak." Neither is there anywhere else. Environment or circumstances are often held responsible for a man's failure or success. To what extent is failure or success rightly attributable to environment or circumstances? History is full of successful men who have surmounted unfavorable circumstances. Give some illustrations. Luck is often assigned as a reason for success. Do you know of any great success which can be attributed to this?

> The heights by great men reached and kept
> Were not attained by sudden flight,
> But they, while their companions slept,
> Were toiling upward in the night.

The habit of self-control, like any specific habit, may be acquired. Refer to the maxims on habit given in Study IV and apply them here. What is the value of athletics in forming the habit of self-control? What game seems best suited for this? Discuss the reasons. The control of one's temper, of a tendency to be lazy, or of any bad habit to which one knows he is addicted, furnishes an excellent opportunity for practice.

The power of self-control is only gradually acquired in youth. It is worth while to stop and think whether you are gaining it. Are there some things which you once found it hard to do that you now do without thinking? Are there some things which you knew to be wrong which you once did which you feel no desire to do now? If so, you are making progress; if not, take yourself strongly in hand, before the lack of self-control becomes habitual. Only thus can you hope to live a self-controlled and successful life.

Self-control comes only as a result of practice. Discuss the value of the two types of discipline found in military schools and in schools giving pupils more freedom of action. What is the value of each type of discipline? What do you think of student "self-government"? In *Tom Brown's School Days* the older boys at Rugby exercised control over the younger. What do you think of "fagging" as practiced there? Would it not be well in every school to develop in the older pupils a sense of responsibility, not only for their own conduct, but also for that of the younger pupils? Suggest some specific ways in which this might be done in your school.

Study XV. Conservation and Efficiency

The words selected as a heading for this study are among those most often found in the newspapers and magazines of the day. The term "conservation" is generally used in connection with the economical use of such natural resources as timber, coal, or soil; the term "efficiency" is generally applied to industry or business and involves the question of securing the largest return with the least expenditure of time, labor, or material. The need of conservation of

the great forests which once covered the land, of the immense bodies of coal and iron under our feet, of the rich soil which covered the prairies of the Middle West, has been realized only when, through our carelessness or extravagance, we are face to face with the danger of their complete exhaustion. Older countries have felt the importance of conservation of natural resources for a long time and have developed effective means to this end. In the well-known Black Forest region in Germany, one finds great forests of trees varying in size from a few feet to full-grown trees, set in rows, carefully trimmed and cared for by trained foresters. The law requires that for all trees cut down others shall be set out. Only recently have schools of forestry been established in this country in which men can be trained to care scientifically for our fast-disappearing forests. Discuss the loss of forests through unnecessary fire; the relation of forests to floods.

Much of our most fertile land has become less productive through our ignorance of scientific methods of farming. Our schools and colleges now give instruction in agriculture to counteract the waste which has been wrought. By soil analysis, rotation of crops, and other scientific methods, these lands will slowly be restored to a part, at least, of their former fertility.

The need of conservation is not confined to such material things as forests and lands. We have been equally wasteful of human life and comfort. Our railroads, factories, and mines are operated at the cost of thousands of lives each year, most of which might be saved. Laws are being passed requiring railroads and manufacturers to provide increased protection against accident and making employers responsible for compensation for accidents to employees. Why have employers tried to prevent the passage of these laws? What relation to conservation have laws restricting the employment of children and shortening the working-day? Why was the law passed prohibiting the use of phosphorus in the manufacture of matches? Give some other illustrations. Jesus said, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27). Apply this principle of Sabbath observance to conservation.

In our great cities there is much waste of human life through bad housing conditions and lack of proper sanitation. Discuss from the point of view of conservation the value of parks and playgrounds, bathing-beaches, the juvenile court, the inspection of milk and other foods. Great progress has been made in medicine in the prevention of disease. Is the Panama Canal more the result of our engineering skill than of our ability to prevent tropical diseases?

We hear much about the high cost of living in these days. What do you think of the statement that the problem is to meet the cost of high living rather than the high cost of living? Can you think of some things which you have and could hardly get on without which your father never had when he was a boy? Can you think of things which you have that you could get on as well or better without? One who lives in the country knows that good fruit rots on the ground each fall because the owner does not find it profitable to ship it to market. How do you reconcile this fact with the

high price of apples in the city market? Why need people anywhere be hungry when there is food enough for all?

In every form of industry, production has been greatly increased by the introduction of labor-saving machinery. Discuss the effect of the invention of the cotton gin. Compare the methods of planting, cultivating, and harvesting crops employed forty years ago with those employed now. What has been the effect of the telephone, the typewriter, the adding machine, and stenography upon business efficiency? Discuss in detail the effect of labor-saving machinery in some industry with which you are familiar.

The introduction of labor-saving machinery has made important changes in our social and industrial life. These changes have been in many respects beneficial; they have also introduced serious social problems. What beneficial results can you mention? What has become of the workmen whose places have been taken by machinery? What has been the effect upon the length of the working-day? What is the value of a shorter working-day to the workman? The shoemaker once performed all the labor involved in the making of a shoe, beginning with the tanned hide, and ending with the finished shoe. Now many workmen have a part in the process, each doing a small part over and over. The result is more and better shoes; but what is the effect upon the workman?

An important gain in efficiency in industry has been made by carefully observing the movements of the workman as he performs his task and carefully eliminating unnecessary movements. Thus it has been found that by providing the material needed in the most convenient way, and by eliminating certain unnecessary movements, a bricklayer can accomplish several times as much work in a given time without additional fatigue. Do you know of any other similar gains that have been made in practical efficiency? Another very important element in successful business has been the utilization of by-products. It is said that in the great meat-packing houses of Chicago no part of the hog is lost but the squeal. Every part of the animal from the blood to the hoofs is used. Valuable by-products are secured in every line of industry; these are said in some cases to be more valuable than the original products. What do you know of the by-products of the steel business, the oil business, of the use of tailings in mines, of the use of cotton seed? Discuss in detail the use of by-products in any industry in your community. Compare the amount of money invested in churches and school buildings with the actual use made of the buildings. Discuss the larger use of these buildings for the social and political needs of the community.

Topics for further discussion: The work of the reclamation service of the government in the Everglades of Florida and the irrigation projects of the West; the preservation and use of the national forests; the coal fields of Alaska.

Study XVI. Conservation and Efficiency—*Continued*

In the last study we discussed conservation and efficiency in their larger aspects as applied to the nation and community and to various industries. In this study we shall make a personal application of the principles involved. It need not be said that an efficient nation or community must be composed of people who are individually efficient and thrifty. Nature has bestowed upon each of us certain resources, the conservation and efficient use of which are essential to our success as individuals. What are these?

We shall agree that our physical resources are of great value. We are not all equally endowed by nature in this respect. It is possible, however, to remedy in large measure what seem to be physical defects. Mr. Roosevelt in the second chapter of his autobiography has told us how from a sickly boy, with no natural bodily prowess, he made himself into the robust and vigorous man with whose physical efficiency the whole world is now familiar. On the other hand, it is possible for one not physically strong to live a long and efficient life by carefully conserving such strength as he has. A good illustration of this is seen in the case of Dr. Lyman Abbott whose interesting autobiography is now appearing in the *Outlook*. In boyhood are laid the foundations of physical efficiency. Careful conformity with the known laws of hygienic living, with proper physical training, will assure the full development of a boy's physical resources. The previous discussions regarding clean thinking and living and the use of stimulants and narcotics have an important bearing on physical efficiency. Discuss the relation of the public parks, playgrounds, and bathing-beaches and -pools to the physical efficiency of the next generation. What bearing has the debated question of sex-hygiene instruction in the public schools to this topic?

Our minds are another of the resources which nature has given us. Which seems to you the more essential to efficiency, the body or the mind? Even more than our bodies, our minds must be properly trained in order to be effective. The schools afford an opportunity for all to train their minds. However, many boys of good natural abilities pass through school and even college whose minds at the end are not well trained and efficient. How do you account for this? It appears certain that it does not make so much difference what one studies, and, within certain limits, how long one studies; mental efficiency depends most upon the mental habits which one has acquired. One of the most important of these is concentration, the power to apply one's mind to a given task to the complete exclusion of everything else. This habit may be acquired. Is your mind inclined to wander from the problem in geometry which you are studying to the coming football game or party? If so, you must bring yourself back to your task by an act of the will. No habit so makes for mental inefficiency as that of divided attention. You will learn your lessons better in half the time and play football better if you hold yourself firmly to each in its proper time and

place. "Work while you work and play while you play" is a maxim of supreme importance. A little thought about your own experience will reveal some other important habits of mind. Which prepares you better for the semester examination, a reasonable amount of work each day, or cramming on the night before the examination? What other mental habits are important?

Does the possession of a strong and well-trained body assure efficiency? A well-trained mind? Is it possible to have both and yet be inefficient? A right attitude toward work must accompany these if efficiency is to be assured. Does the world owe anyone a living? If you had a million dollars and a good education what do you think you would do? Which seems to you likely to apply the severest test to character, wealth or poverty? What reasons have you for thinking that your life would not be happy if you should do no work?

The habit of saving is as essential to individual happiness as it is to business success. Which do you think will contribute more to a man's prosperity, the habit of saving or an increase in wages? The habit of saving may be acquired early. Do you keep a careful account of all the money you receive and spend? Mr. Rockefeller did this when he was earning a few dollars a week as a clerk. Boys who receive weekly allowances often grow up without any idea of the value of money. This may prove a great misfortune later. How can a boy who has never earned any money have any sense of its value?

People sometimes seem to think that disregard for the value of money makes them socially conspicuous. These are likely to be of the class known as "newly rich." In what ways are the boys in your set wasteful? Are you just as careful not to waste or destroy the property of your school or of your employer as you would be if it were your own? Should a traveling man whose expenses are paid spend more money than if he were on his own expense? Jesus gave a good object-lesson in economy when after feeding the multitude he had the fragments of bread and fish gathered up in order that none should be lost (Luke 19:12–17).

Topics for further discussion: The relation of recreation to efficiency; forms of recreation best suited to boyhood and to mature manhood; the value of a college education from the point of view of efficiency.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. IV

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH.D.
Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago

Perhaps the most important fact to realize in religious education is that we are dealing with a developing being. It is a common remark that certain parents or teachers seem to forget that they ever were young, and it is literally true that to a degree we all forget that we were young. We are not only larger and older, but we are different from what we were as children and as youth. We have changed structurally and the change has taken place so gradually that we are not clearly conscious of it. The bane of education has been that elders fail to recognize the different capacity, structure, and point of view of the younger. Hence the cardinal importance of a scientific understanding of human development.

An excellent book for this purpose is Kirkpatrick's *Fundamentals of Child Study*. His method of treatment is indicated in the subtitle, "A Discussion of Instincts and Other Factors in Human Development with Practical Applications." This takes us again, as in the educational works already studied, to the subject of instinct, but the treatment is much fuller, and is genetic; that is to say, it is concerned with the consideration of the time at which each instinct is naturally most prominent and with the changes in the expression of the instinct which are produced by age and which may be produced by education.

The first group of instincts is the individualistic—those concerned with self-preservation. Kirkpatrick calls attention to the proper place which these inevitably have in human development. Perhaps this is especially important as a warning to the religious educator. We are so much concerned with the development of a fine unselfishness that we may easily seek to produce it too soon. It may be a question whether our author is correct in regarding the child before puberty as so entirely under the control of the individualistic instincts. There are reasons for believing that genuine unselfishness is possible in children. And yet we are far more likely to err in the endeavor to produce a precocious altruism than we are in recognizing frankly the prevailing selfness of childhood and leading it to simple co-operations and sharing of goods which may be the basis of later altruistic development. It is interesting that even fighting is regarded by Kirkpatrick as an instinct that must not be too

seriously interfered with, and one which may result in useful lessons.

The great basis for altruistic and moral development is found in the parental instinct, which is regarded as a basis for the social instincts. The educational suggestions here are particularly valuable. The author does not discuss the question of sex hygiene in the schools but lays the emphasis upon frank talks between the parent and child, beginning very early in life.

The chapter on play is of great importance. It is a psychological study on the basis of which may be estimated the practical proposals of the other books which we are to review. Perhaps there is no subject which the church and religious people have understood so little as play. It has been thought of as a more or less inevitable waste of time, or as a peril to be carefully watched, or as a useful sugar-coating for a religious pill. We must recognize the large function of play, "Nature's jolly nurse," in the development of human life. Our author deals in a very excellent way with the development of play from childhood to youth and shows its moral worth as an expression of "law as a means of freedom."

There is a chapter definitely devoted to moral and religious education conceived as a development of the "regulative instinct." Kirkpatrick lays great emphasis upon the marked change in this development at puberty. Up to twelve years of age the moral condition is almost wholly the result of environment and training. At pubescence comes the new possibility of choice between acts for one's self and acts for others. As already indicated, this is perhaps too hard-and-fast a distinction but the educational suggestions for the transition period are none the less valuable. The treatment of religion is brief but the protest against the intellectualizing of religion in the early education of the Protestant churches is certainly based on a sound psychology.

The later suggestions of this book are of perhaps more concern to the public-school teacher. And yet we do well to take account in our religious education of the problems of the peculiar, defective, abnormal, and exceptional child. And, indeed, if we can ever secure a sufficiently trained body of teachers, our small classes ought to give us an opportunity for individual work which the mass education of the public school does not afford.

A distinguished scholar recently said: "Almost anyone can bring up a child religiously but the serious question arises when adolescence appears." The statement is not to be taken literally but it represents a comparison which is true. A fact of most serious import is that it is just at the beginning of youth that all of the educational agencies lose their hold upon a large majority of the young people. The legal age for leaving school is the time when the boys and girls by thousands fling off the yoke and strike out for freedom. It is just at this time (at about fourteen) that the children who have been so amenable to Sunday-school education become irregular in attendance and drop out because the church has ceased to be of interest to them. And it is at about this same age that the fathers and mothers begin to be concerned because parental control is no longer so easy as it was. It

will not do to say that the youth slip away from us because the religious education of childhood has been inadequate. In many cases there has been an excellent understanding of the boys and girls and a regimen well adapted to their development. But with the coming of youth there are different conditions which it behooves parents and educators to take into account. Failing this, the well-trained child may easily become the careless or vicious or criminal youth.

These manifest conditions have caused a widespread interest in the study of youth. One of the most practical and valuable of these studies is *The Boy Problem*, by Forbush. The suggestions of the book grew out of the practical work of the author as a city pastor in his work with boys. It may be said here parenthetically that a book very much to be desired is upon the girl problem, for those who are engaged in the training of girls realize that the problem of their healthy development is no whit less significant and intricate than that of their brothers. As a matter of fact, we do not know so much about girl psychology. The books on the education of youth are therefore mostly concerned with boys.

Forbush presents a careful study of the social development of boys, with a good deal of dependence on G. Stanley Hall's *Adolescence*. The recognized biological and psychological principles involved in this study are well and popularly set forth. The author accepts the theory that the individual rehearses the race life and builds somewhat fully upon it. This theory has not the vogue that it had a few years ago, and will doubtless have to be so modified as to leave little of practical educational value in it. But the use of the theory in this book does not in any wise vitiate the main contentions and suggestions which it presents.

A most significant characteristic of boy life is, of course, its social expressions in gangs and societies. There are certain societies of a simpler character that precede puberty and then there is a peculiar social development known as the "gang." Forbush believes that the "gang" is a natural boy development which may be seized and used, if well understood. He has a chapter of criticism of boys' clubs and church work for boys in which he points out the inadequacy and the unsatisfactory character of many attempts that have been made to hold boys because of the failure to realize their needs and interests. The Christian Endeavor Society comes in for trenchant criticism. The constructive chapter on "What the Church May Do for Boys" is full of valuable suggestions. Dr. Forbush is, of course, widely known as the originator of the Knights of King Arthur and he here presents the essential characteristics of the order. He is a thorough believer in some form of chivalric organization to meet the heroic ideals of early adolescence. Simpler societies for younger boys may be organized and that of the Woodcraft Indians is here commended. The book is packed with excellent practical suggestions on such subjects as preparation for church membership, relations of fathers and boys, of pastors and boys, the opportunities of the home and of the public school. It is all in all a healthy and natural appeal for the

good understanding and sane treatment of youth.

A later and most excellent study of boy life in relation to the church is Hoben's *The Minister and the Boy.* The author, an enthusiastic worker with boys in city, college, and country, as also a scientific student of the problem in its normal as well as its pathological aspects, here gives vital suggestions to the minister who would understand his responsibility to the boys of his parish. The book is a plea for the ministry of personal friendship based on genuine understanding of boy life. It holds out to the ministry the opportunity of gaining the love and loyalty of youth as one of the most rewarding of his endeavors.

The work for boys is not to be institutionalized outside of the church, nor is the minister's part to be taken from him by any other organization. If the minister is or can learn to be a leader of boys, his is the place and the church is the field. Of course the work for boys must be done largely outside the traditional limits of church activity, for these have not been established to a great extent in sympathy with youthful interests.

Let one read this book to get the flavor of boy life and the joy of boy leadership. Boys are not here presented as social nuisances who are somehow to be circumvented and kept busy so that they will not do too much harm; they are candidates for manhood, citizenship, Christ-discipleship, the period and character of whose candidacy are intensely interesting and significant. Not that the dangers of rudeness, vulgarity, vice, are here overlooked. The pathos of this easy declension is a motive underlying all the discussion. But through it all is the faith that there is a genuineness about youth which makes a virile leadership worth while and holds out largest promise of success.

The book is full of practical suggestions. It deals with boyhood in the village and country and in the city, showing how each may be helped in the local conditions. It discusses scientifically and practically the ethical value of organized play. It supplements the excellent treatment by Forbush of the boys' club in the church. Let the suggestion be especially heeded that the club is not to be used as a bait for Sunday-school attendance or church membership, but is to be a genuine opportunity of good in itself.

The boy's religious life is presented as essentially objective, though with its critical times of subjective experience, these generally centering about a concrete moral problem. The minister is to be respectful in his approach to the inner sanctuary of personality and to beware of the rude intrusion that our common evangelism often employs.

There is a specific phase of the problem of the religious education of youth which must receive serious attention in the coming days. It is that of the so-called questionable amusements. In the three books discussed above considerable emphasis has been placed upon the educational value of play. It is conceded to have a definite biological basis and to be of great significance in the development of life. But what play shall it be? Athletic play, of course, is of the highest value and there is no longer need to argue for its status in our educational schemes. There is only

need that it shall be conducted under such conditions as to make it really educational and to eliminate the various dangers and selfishnesses that easily creep into it. But there is another type of amusement, calling for individual skill, that is of great interest to boys and young men. Specifically, for example, billiards and bowling. What are the churches to do about that? "Beer and skittles" is a collocation of terms from the time when the saloon had its bowling-alley as a matter of course. "Pool-rooms" have an unsavory suggestion of vulgarity, gambling, and drunkenness. The church has quite generally taken a definite attitude of interdiction as regards these and many other youthful indulgences. The whole question will have to be thought out anew in the light of fact and reason. There is not much literature upon the subject as yet. A little book has recently appeared which may serve very well as a basis of discussion. Milnes's *The Church and the Young Man's Game* is a definite plea for the introduction of billiard tables into church basements and parish houses for the purpose of affording healthful and valuable amusement to the young people.

The book is published for the National Indoor Game Association, an organization "to safeguard the young man's leisure hours, to shield him from vice and low ideals, where temptation assails him most, to ameliorate the atmosphere of his favorite games, and to make unwholesome game-rooms clean up or close up by the principle of substitution." It calls attention to the enormous loss of young manhood from the church and attributes it largely to the fact that the church is concerned only with child interests, and feminine interests, and mature interests. The economic argument is urged of the wastefulness of the expensive church plants kept unused six-sevenths of the time. The game of billiards is analyzed and defended by one who understands it and has seen it played under wholesome conditions. Numerous examples are cited of churches that have greatly increased their hold upon young men by the adoption of this natural appeal to their interests.

A striking phase of the discussion is the suggestion of the enrichment of rural life that may be possible by this means with the result of holding the youth in the country where they might be quite content to stay if only there were "something doing."

The problems of card-playing, dancing, and theater-going are not discussed in this little book. Each of them stands on a different basis, and yet we shall have to consider very wisely and sympathetically the increasing desire of our young people to enjoy these forms of recreation. Can they be made wholesome? Can the good be conserved and the bad eliminated? Can discrimination and good taste be developed? Can we gain more by appreciation than by prohibition? These are urgent questions in religious education that probably are of more importance than a great many of the matters that are engaging the attention of scientific experts and religious workers.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. What are the essential differences between childhood and youth religion?

2. What are the differences between boys and girls in their moral and religious development?

3. How far have the various types of boys' clubs been successful? What are their limitations?

4. What part of his time and energy may the minister devote to the specific leadership of boys?

5. What is the wise co-ordination of the church and the Y.M.C.A. in work for boys and for young men?

6. How far shall we recognize the "gang" in religious education? Is it a fundamental social unit?

7. What attitude shall we take today toward youthful interest in the various popular recreations and amusements?

SOME FURTHER WORKS

G. Stanley Hall, *Adolescence* (2 vols.), or the shorter work *Youth, Its Education, Regimen, and Hygiene.*
Chamberlain, *The Child.*
Caroline Latimer, *Girl and Woman.*
John L. Alexander, *Boy Training.*
Willson, *The American Boy and the Social Evil.*
Jane Addams, *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets.*
J. Adams Puffer, *The Boy and His Gang.*
William B. Forbush, *The Coming Generation.*
Official Handbook, Boy Scouts of America.
Official Handbook, Campfire Girls of America.

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS[1]

At first glance there would seem to be little unity in the content of the books to be reviewed during the coming month. There is a genuine point of contact in the situation out of which these books arose. They should first be examined by the leader with special reference to what each reflects of the difficulties of the Christians in the post-Pauline period. Close study will also be worth while in order to determine the distinctive interpretations of the principles of Jesus by these early followers. The religious value of these books will lie in a study of the courage and candor with which their writers assailed the evils of their day, and instructed and exhorted their fellow-Christians, and also in our own effort to estimate these interpretations and to reinterpret these same principles of Jesus in the light of modern thought.

In handling the *letters* treated in this period the leader will not meet with presuppositions on the part of the class. The approach to the Book of Revelation, however, must be particularly guarded on account of the superficial familiarity of the group with this book, and the traditional associations which have gathered about it. It is essential that the class approach the study of this unique book with an open mind and the leader should carefully prepare the way for such a condition, by emphasizing the historical situation and discussing the whole question of apocalyptic literature. A careful study of the work of this month is the best possible preparation for the last subject of the course, the Gospel of John and the letters which bear his name.

Program I

Leader: A brief survey of the great persecutions of the Christians through the centuries and their causes.

Members: (1) Selections from First

[1] The suggestions relate to the ninth month's work, the student's material for which appears in the *Biblical World* for May and may be obtained in pamphlet reprints for use with classes. Address: THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE, The University of Chicago.

Peter which reflect a condition of persecution of the Christians, and the consolations which the author offers; (2) the Letter to the Hebrews—its authorship and purpose, and a condensed statement of the exhortations which it contains; (3) the letter of James—an analysis, the danger which the author is trying to meet, the incentives which he suggests; (4) the apocryphal Book of Enoch.

Question for discussion: Is it important that we should know exactly who wrote each of the books included in the study of the month?

Program II

Leader: A brief presentation of the history of the interpretation of the Book of Revelation.

Members: (1) The seer's vision of the giver of the Revelation 1:9–20 (a reading); (2) the seven churches—their location, a paraphrase in plain language of the message to each; (3) selected readings of passages from the Revelation indicating the final triumph of Christ and his kingdom.

Question for discussion: If true peace and joy come out of tribulation is it a disaster, or, in other words, can there be strength in Christian faith and Christian character which has not endured tribulation?

REFERENCE READING

Weizsacker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, pp. 160–205; McGiffert, *The Apostolic Age*, chaps. i and vi; von Soden, *The History of Early Christian Literature*, chap. iii; Weiss, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, II, 1–174; Peake, *Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 72–100; Julicher, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 148–74, 201–41, 256–91; Moffatt, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 318–72, 420–74, 483–514; Scott, *The Apologetic of the New Testament*, pp. 193–210; Wrede, *The Origin of the New Testament*, pp. 102–29; Bigg, *International Critical Commentary*, St. Peter and St. Jude; Lumby, *The Expositor's Bible*, Epistles of Peter; Major, *Epistle of St. Jude and Second Epistle of Peter: New Century Bible*, the general epistles and Revelation. *The Bible for Home and School*, volume on Hebrews; *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, volumes on St. Peter and St. Jude, and Revelation; see also Hastings' *Bible Dictionary* for articles on all books considered.

CURRENT OPINION

The Teaching of Hebrew

In the Roman church, as in other denominations, many think that Hebrew is no longer an essential part of the preparation of a clergyman. In a paper on "Hebrew in Our Seminaries," written by R. Butin in the *Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1914, a claim is made for Hebrew studies. Specialists are wanted in the church; none can aim at being a professional Scripturist who has not studied scientifically the original languages of the Bible. Nothing at times is more unreliable than a translation, and certainly first-class work cannot be done on a translation. But some Hebrew ought to be taken by students while they are undergraduates (in the seminary), so that while at the university they will not spend so much time in acquiring elementary knowledge, but will at once undertake real philological work. How could a student find out whether or not he has a taste for oriental languages unless he is given an opportunity to test himself and to choose intelligently? Only certain classes of students ought to be excused from Hebrew; at the end of the first year a selection could be made, and thus by a process of elimination specialists of the highest ability could be discovered by this process of gradual selection.

Roman Catholicism in France

There seems to be for many Romanists a special conception of history. Shall we call it "polemical history"? To such a class belong usually the writings of Hilaire Belloc. In a series of articles published in the *Catholic World* since November, 1912, Mr. Belloc makes a study of "The Church and French Democracy." The historical part of it is not remarkable except as a sample of this kind of polemical history. For instance, Mr. Belloc tells us that at the end of the seventeenth century, Protestants were far more numerous in France than they are now. True, but why does not Mr. Belloc make a passing allusion to the energetic and faithful 500,000 Protestants who went over to England, Holland, and Germany at the Revocation of the Edict de Nantes? It is well known that Protestants in France are usually better off than Roman Catholics. Mr. Belloc, alluding to this, speaks of "the founders of that capitalistic system which is so odious to the Catholic [i.e., Romanist] temper." More interesting are remarks made by Mr. Belloc on the present state of French society. The anti-Catholic forces in Latin countries, and in semi-Latin countries like France, do not, as Mr. Belloc shows, constitute a general, circumambient atmosphere; they are a compact and organized special array. In Protestant countries Romanism is aggressive, boastful, and not always successful (Mr. Belloc does not admit this); in Latin countries it is probably less conscious of the strength of its position than its adversaries. Is it not paradoxical to maintain, as Mr. Belloc does, that the French people are proving their vitality in nothing more than the fact that they are today more interested in theology than any other people in Europe? It is true that most leading French newspapers are unfriendly to the Roman church and that they often attack it even in their editorials, but this is not theology. The fate of the Roman church is being fought out in France just now, but neither the arguments used by "anticlericals" nor those voiced by the defenders of the church are worth very much from the point of view of theology. In Paris and some other cities in the North more men can be seen in the churches than ten years ago; there would be still more —although the *Catholic World* will never print this while Pius X lives—if the mod-

ernist clergy had not been crushed by the Jesuits. Some time ago, somebody asked M. de Narfon, a well-known French Roman Catholic, "What about Catholicism in France; is it getting stronger?" "No," answered M. de Narfon, "the Pope is well."

Abbé Lemire, who was very popular in the north of France and had been for many years a member of the Chamber of Deputies, has been suspended from the priesthood, not because he was not a good Catholic, but because he had democratic tendencies. As long as the papacy persists in the policy of reaction against modern thought, there seems to be very little hope for a Renaissance of Roman Catholicism in France. Struggling little Protestant missions now make little impression on the country, but American Christians who are supporting Baptist, Methodist, or McAll mission work in France are investing money in a good cause. Two or three more popes like Pius X, and France will become a Protestant nation.

Spiritual Body and Resurrection

Dr. Goudge writes on "The Resurrection of Our Lord and the Relation of the Eucharist to the Mysteries" in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1914. There seems to be at first no connection between these two doctrines, but they are built on the same notion of a "spiritual body." Indeed, such a notion seems to be too often ignored by Protestant critics. They usually contrast strongly the material and the spiritual, and this distinction has permeated their conception of theology and especially their views of the sacraments and their criticism of the resurrection. But if this distinction between matter and spirit is found in Greek paganism and in semi-Christian heresies like Manicheism, it is unknown in Hebrew and primitive Christian thought, where the notion of a spiritual body transcends both. St. Paul and the Evangelists believed that the body of the Lord was just as real after the resurrection as before; it was the same body, the tomb was found empty on the Easter morning, and it was the Lord's resurrection which caused it to be empty. From the point of view of popular thought, there was and there is no difficulty in such a doctrine. As the vast majority will never know and does not care to know the nature of the change from water to steam, the fact of the change being enough, so many find no difficulty in the doctrine of the resurrection. Such "simple faith" deserves neither praise nor blame. The church which is "debtor both to the wise and to the unwise" must take account of it. Dr. Goudge shows also how there is no difficulty in the doctrine of the resurrection from the point of view of metaphysics. The metaphysician, like the ordinary man, finds himself in the presence of a mystery, and may, like the ordinary man, dislike mysteries, but he can neither prove nor disprove them. As for scientific thought, it is on the whole but a variety of popular thought, and this is why it has nothing to do with metaphysics. The man of science who has had a philosophical training does not treat very seriously the conceptions of law, force, and matter, although he makes a popular use of them; no criticism of the resurrection ought to forget that science deals with current phenomena only and has therefore nothing to say on the resurrection of the Lord.

There is, however, some difference between the resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection of believers. The sinless body of the Lord was ready to become the true expression of his sinless spirit, but our own bodies, as we have them today, are not ready to become the true expression of the saints we are yet to become. So we may conceive, as Dr. Goudge says, that we need to pass through a deeper death in the body than the Lord experienced before we can put on immortality. But for all that the resurrection of Jesus is the type of our own.

The Episcopalians and the Question of Negro Bishops

In the *East and West* for January, 1914, Bishop Gailor, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, writes on "The Problem of a Racial Episcopate in the American Episcopal Church." Bishop Gailor shows how, after the Civil War, the mental attitude of the southern white man was more sympathetic than now. This is largely owing to the agitation created by false friends of the negro. The racial feeling has been intensified on both sides. One of the results of it is that in several dioceses the negro members of the church have little to say in matters of administration. By the side of the diocesan conventions, negro convocations have been organized and work under the control of the white bishop. This is, however, unfair to the negro, and many, both among white southerners and negro churchmen, advocate the creation of a negro episcopate. There would be a kind of negro missionary bishop over the congregations scattered in the southern states. There is a strong feeling that this departure from the conception of a territorial episcopate, without distinction of classes or color, would be dangerous and might eventually lead to the creation of a dissenting Episcopalian negro church if the negro bishop did not co-operate with his white colleagues. Thus far the measure has not been adopted by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal church.

Pan-Islamism, Ancient and Modern

We hear often of the downfall of Islam as a political power. In an article on "Die weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Islam" published by Dr. M. Ritzenthaler, in *Religion und Geisterkultur* for January, 1914, we see the other side of the question. As a political power, Turkey has become weaker and weaker, but Mohammedanism was a power long before there was a Turkish empire and will remain one of the greatest powers to be reckoned with when Turkey will have ceased to exist. Islam is not merely a religion like other religions, it is the religion of the Near East. The conflict between East and West never ceased around the Mediterranean. Even when the Roman Empire was established and when Constantinople was founded, we see signs of revolt, a kind of *Los von Byzanz*, in the different heresies which brought about the existence of several national churches, Coptic, Nestorian, Armenian, etc. But all these forces were scattered and for a while, western culture, practical, firm, rational, intolerant, leveling, triumphed over eastern civilizations. Mohammedanism was the principle of union. Mohammed himself would never have dreamed that. He did not want to be, he did not think he was, the founder of a new religion. Schopenhauer has called the Koran a "bad" book; certainly it is not a "new" book, but it was simple, anti-rationalist; it appealed to the whole character of a man of the East, passions included, and thus the teaching of the prophet of Islam became the means of emancipation of the East from the West. Now it seems that Europe has lost to a great extent its religiosity and that rationalism reigns supreme. Not so in the East where religion is still the main factor in social life. Pan-Islamism, whether in Turkey or India or Africa, is an anti-European movement. It is absurd, says Dr. Ritzenthaler, to speak of the bankruptcy of pan-Islamism because Turkey, the champion of Islam, has lost a few provinces, mainly inhabited by Christians. Pan-Islamism is not a power that you can defeat on a battlefield. There was a time when Europe sent Crusaders against the Mohammedans; then the Moslems could understand their adversaries; on both sides there was intolerant belief. Now modern Crusaders are merchants, engineers, financiers, diplomats, tourists; they make no show of religion and are therefore looked

upon as atheists. Mohammedans think that they are therefore superior to the Europeans. Pan-Islamism embodies their anti-European feelings and this is why as a movement it grows in importance in spite of and perhaps because of recent defeats of the Turks.

A Social Program for New York City

Foremost leaders of religious thought and social service have united in commendation of the *Social Program for Greater New York* which is issued by the Brooklyn Bureau of Charities. The second edition is now published, and may be obtained by addressing the bureau at 69 Schermerhorn St., Brooklyn. The publication is of wide interest because it applies in principle to all of our American cities. It has ten divisions, relating to labor problems, housing, health, education, leisure time, criminology, philanthropy, city planning, social forces, and politics, giving the names and addresses of eighty-five specialists who are prepared to lecture and advise upon various phases of these vital subjects.

Under the head of "Labor Problems" are considered the standard of living in New York, cost of living, women's wages, unemployment, provision for sickness, industrial compensation, provision for widowhood and old age, hours of labor, child-labor, and conflicts between labor and capital. The program provides one or more lecturers for each subdivision of the labor theme; and under each subdivision is printed a syllabus indicating the ground covered. For instance, the lectures on the highly interesting subject of the cost of living are treated as follows:

The Cost of Living in New York

The advance in prices compared with increase in wages and incomes; the increase or curtailment in production relative to growth of population; changes in the proportion of the proceeds of industry going to labor, capital, and consumer respectively; influence of increased gold output on these changes; influence of the tariff and other trade restrictions; rent, cost of marketing, and other local factors in the cost of living. Establishment of municipal markets, control of rent through taxation, transit provision, etc., regulation of local monopolies, organization of the consumer, and other proposals for reducing the cost of living.

It will be noticed that the methods emphasized for controlling the cost of living revolve around the treatment of monopoly as it appears in the private proprietorship of markets, transportation, and real estate. The item "control of rent through taxation" refers to the pending Herrick-Shaap bill, which proposes to shift the burden of taxation gradually from "improvements" to "land values." This measure is again emphasized in the second general division of the program, "Housing, Congestion, and Rents."

The third division, relating to "Health Problems," takes up the prevention of disease, application of eugenics, inspection of foods, drinks, and drugs, care of the sick, education in hygiene, preventive medicine. The fourth division, "Public and Private Education," takes up methods of pedagogy in the public schools, character-training, vocational guidance, private schools. Under the head of the "Leisure Time Problem" are taken up the wage-earner's opportunities for self-improvement, outdoor recreation, social intercourse, commercialized amusements, etc. The division relating to "Criminology" considers the causes of vice and crime, the liquor problem, vagrancy and mendicancy, the social evil, criminal law, etc. Under "Philanthropy" are considered the relief of destitution, care of dependents, etc.; under "City Planning," the street systems, distribution of traffic, public utilities, beautification, etc.; under "Social Forces," formation of public opinion, social work of the churches, neighborhood organization, immigration; under "Politics and Government," the state

constitution, legislative methods, administrative systems, selection and removal of public officials, charter revision, political parties, the taxation system, and regulation of corporations.

This is altogether a most impressive and intelligent program. New York is to be congratulated on the possession of specialists who are qualified to handle such a great variety of themes. A similar conspectus of social forces should be made everywhere.

Gnosticism and Islam

In the *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* for August, 1913, E. Blochet writes on Mohammedan gnosticism. Gnostic sects were more powerful in the Asiatic and Egyptian section of the Byzantine world. When these provinces were conquered by the Mohammedan invaders the gnostic doctrine found its way into Islam. We must bear in mind that the Islamic world was without a theology, without science, and without civilization. As in the case of the Japanese who translated into their language our scientific books, and thus possess an excellent literature which has not cost them, as it has our race, centuries of constant effort, the Arabs assimilated the Byzantine culture. The whole system of Byzantine thought was transposed into the Arabic literature. Strange to say, the Arabs believed that the Egyptian hieroglyphics were records of occultism; but it seems that Greek writers had already been of the same opinion. Gnostic influence can be traced to the Egyptian cycle of stories in the *Arabian Knights*, where the conception of the wonderful is so concrete. In order to forget the miseries of present life, Gnostics and Mohammedans have peopled the aerial spaces with a race of superhuman beings who rule over the elements and can mold matter and transmute it. Some mystical developments of Islam, like Sufism, are to a great extent a continuation of mysticism.

Maeterlinck and the Curia Romana

Somebody has said that the *Index* contains most books that are worth while reading. When Maeterlinck's works were put on the *Index*, many were surprised: why does the Curia romana concern himself with the mistlike broodings of the Belgian writer upon our highly artificial modern life? Surely in these beautiful but vague poetizings there seems to be little danger for theological thought. In the *Université catholique* for February, 1914, M. Joseph Lerre justifies the action of the Congregation of the *Index* against Maeterlinck in an article on "Maeterlinck philosophe." M. Lerre says that Maeterlinck has lost himself in the mazes of pantheism. He has seen the divine in Nature, but even in his *Treasure of the Humble* he seems already so wrapped up in the contemplation of this "deep and starry soul," which is the true "treasure of the humble," that the soul and the world and God are confused in a kind of mysterious concept. Since then Maeterlinck has become more systematic and clearer; the poet has become a philosopher, the mystic has turned rationalist, and it is a sad sign of the times that modern agnostics who have little imagination understand the latest works of Maeterlinck; it is a sign of failure for a soul which was so strangely haunted by the sense of the divine, of the mysterious, of the infinite. Although Maeterlinck writes in splendid French, his thought has not the classical Gallic lucidity and his pantheism leads him into strange contradictions. Truth, he writes, may be at an incommensurable distance from these contradictory ideas which loom quite large to us but are probably not more important than a shower falling on the ocean. If it is so, says M. Lerre, our faith will have to abdicate in favor of reason, and, after all, such a decision is the necessary result of agnosticism and of non-Christian thought; when really philosophical it is bound to end in hopeless

skepticism. The world, after all, is a poor kind of god, a god who has not yet become wise, who is blind, immoral, and absurd. Again, do we have a right to look up to death as the great mysterious solvent of our intellectual difficulties and as the end of all our troubles? Is it not absurd to think that this earthly body has the monopoly of suffering? We know that, even in this life, the soul suffers more than the body; in fact, the soul suffers in the body. Then, is there anything real in a thought which survives to itself when the ego is no more? Is not thought the ego itself, the ego thinking? If there is no judgment after death, no putting right of what was wrong in our lives, why should we be free and responsible? And if we are not free we have no use for ethical concepts. Pantheism leads to fatalism and fatalism kills morality. A book like *La Mort*, says M. Lerre, is a demonstration of the truth of the Christian doctrine; it shows in the words of a modern "freethinker" that when a man has rejected Christian doctrine he is quite at a loss to know why he has come to live in this world and what he has to do here. M. Lerre is right, but was it necessary to put Maeterlinck's books on the *Index?* The next result of this move of the Curia romana will be to make good sellers of all the new books of Maeterlinck.

The Apostolic Decree of Acts 15:29

Dr. W. B. Bacon writes on "The Apostolic Decree against πορνεία" in the *Expositor* for January, 1914. Dr. Bacon refuses to identify the apostolic council of Acts, chap. 15, either with the conference between Paul and the "pillars" described in Gal. 2:1–10, or with any subsequent visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem. The story of Acts, chap. 15, would be an idealizing historian's combination of two distinct occasions: (1) the conference of Paul and Barnabas with the "pillars"; (2) a conclave at Jerusalem at which neither Paul nor Peter was present. The decrees represent the solution which became valid for Peter and the Judaizers, which, however, was not accepted by Paul nor by the Pauline churches beyond the Cilician gates. The decrees themselves are not a fiction of the author of the Acts but have as their basis some authentic document. In sharp opposition to Paul, the decrees rest upon a sacramentarian conception of purity. The current opinion of "distinctions of meat" was that they protect the indwelling divine life from union with the demonic; demons were supposed to feed on things strangled, as on blood. As for fornication, it is even by Paul prohibited on religious grounds, and the parallel between "meats" and "fornication" rests ultimately upon the heathen conception that the two functions of nutrition and reproduction are special means of union with divine life. The "apostolic" decrees aimed first of all at the protection of Jewish Christians from pollution when associating with gentile Christians, all pollutions, voluntary or not, uniting to the alien life of the demons; these regulations for the preservation of the purity of the people of the Lord that are under the Law in their intercourse with the new people of the Lord without the Law were enacted, according to Dr. Bacon, before the results of the first missionary journey were known in Jerusalem. The conception of purity in Paul is more ethical; his sacramental mysticism transcends the ritualistic views of the Judaizers.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

Mass Movements toward Christianity

It seems sometimes that our highly organized missions are unable to cope with the situation created by mass movements toward Christianity. For instance, in Gujerat (India) thousands of outcast peoples are asking to be received into the church but there is a scarcity of teachers to prepare them for baptism. In Southern Nigeria a negro preacher (who is an independent worker) has baptized hundreds of natives for a fee without any examination on the faith. It is sad to say that Christians of England have given financial support to such a man.

Mohammedan Susceptibility

The British government of India has learned wisdom since the days of the Mutiny. A Japanese firm shipped to Calcutta 2,000 mats inscribed with the *Kalma* or creed of Islam: "There is no God but Allah and Mohammed is the prophet of Allah." It was feared that natives would object to such a desecration of their creed and the consignment has been kept at the custom house (*Moslem World*).

The Church in Fiji

Mission work was begun in 1835 in Fiji. Now out of the 90,000 native inhabitants of the islands, 83,000 claim that they are Methodists, 33,000 of these are full members. The native church is very generous. Last year £10,700 were contributed for mission work by the Fijians themselves. There is, however, a large number of non-Christian East Indians in the islands, and this number is increased by immigration. There lies a mission field for the young church of Fiji.

Thinking Black and Finding God

Modern missionaries do not look upon heathenism as a nameless mixture of gloom and vice; they study with sympathy and with a scientific method the yearnings of man after God; they want to understand and love and not to condemn wholesale, and this is why they are doing such good work—although mission work is more difficult now that civilization and the liquor traffic permeate the whole world. In the *International Review of Missions* for January, 1914, Mr. H. A. Yunod writes on "God's Ways in the Bantu Soul," a subject of which he is a master. The Bantu are the negroes of South Africa. Their religion is a kind of dualism: they fear the departed spirits of their ancestors who are a kind of gods, while they know of the existence of a higher Being very often identified with the sky. This elementary theology gives place very easily to the Christian doctrine of God or something very much like it: when the native hears of the God of heaven, he writes in a living synthesis his vague conceptions of the ancestor gods and the sky god. Magic holds, however, a larger place than religion in the Bantu mind, but even there the very real faith of a Bantu in the spirit world, which can be subdued by charms and otherwise, prepares them for a striking faith in the spirit of God, ever present with us and in us. The whole life of a Bantu is dominated by the notion of taboo, and this belief testifies to a longing for material and ceremonial purity. This notion of taboo can be spiritualized: the great taboo is moral defilement, and although this is a difficult lesson, the Bantu can spell it out for himself.

Is a Bantu a Christian when he has accepted the Christian doctrine which is such a wonderful answer to the queries of his

mind and the longings of his heart? Some missionaries have tried to make havoc of the black man's thoughts and fill his memory with definitions of white men's dogmas. It is a sad mistake, just like the antagonistic position taken toward native customs by many missionaries who forget that their own countries after centuries of Christianity are not perfect. Christ did not come to destroy but to fulfil.

Autonomy among the Baptist Karens in Burma

Mr. D. C. Gilmore writes in the *Baptist Missionary Review* of January, 1914, on the subject of self-support and self-government among Baptist Karens of Burma. There are 914,641 Karens in Burma; about 12 per cent are adherents of Baptist churches. There are 48,688 communicants. During the year ending March, 1913, these Baptist Karens contributed Rs. 330,531 for church work. Christian Karens are not usually isolated; in fact, villages which are preponderatingly Christian are common. This makes self-support easier.

Among the Karens, and to a certain extent among the other races of Burma, local Baptist churches connected with each mission station are united into an association; all the Baptists of Burma who are affiliated with the American Baptist Mission are united in the Burma Baptist Convention. This organization raises money and sends out native evangelists. From the very beginning of missionary work among them the Karens were taught to be autonomous. The local churches look, however, to the association for help and guidance in certain cases; financial assistance, when needed by weaker congregations, comes from their sister-churches. Every church calls its own pastor and severs the connection with him sometimes with the advice of the missionary, sometimes without. The main element in the missionary influence is that pastors and people look to him as a religious teacher, a biblical expert; his advice is sought in difficult cases. The best missionaries know how to keep out of the internal affairs of the native churches, but they can do a great work of encouragement and inspiration by their visitations of the churches. As a matter of fact a Karen church is on the same footing as a Baptist church in America. The majority of Karen Christians do not desire the withdrawal of the missionaries in the near future. An "independent Karen mission" has been started in Burma under Karen leaders. If this native organization works well, the cause of entire autonomy of the Karen Baptist churches will be gained.

Versions of the Bible in Colloquial Arabic

It was thought years ago that the translation of the Bible into literary Arabic would meet the needs of all Arabic-speaking people. But now that we know the Mohammedan world better we see that very few indeed among them have an intelligent knowledge of literary Arabic. In Algeria and Morocco, for instance, although Arabic is the mother-tongue of millions, literary Arabic does not mean more to the average man than Latin to a Spaniard or an Italian. Colloquial (or vulgar) Arabic is a language *sui generis* with a traditional grammar; its vocabulary is very rich but its grammar compared to that of the literary Arabic is very easy. Both in Algeria and in Morocco missionaries have attempted translations of the Scriptures and hymns in the various colloquial dialects spoken there. The British and Foreign Bible Society printed, in 1909, seven thousand copies of a colloquial version of St. Luke in Algerian colloquial. There are five great varieties of colloquial Arabic spoken in Algeria and an attempt was made to translate the gospel into a kind of common dialect. These seven thousand copies sold off in less than two years. An edition of ten thousand

copies of the Gospel of John, published in 1911, is now exhausted. In Morocco, the first edition of St. Luke is also out of print. Other portions of the Bible have been published and are selling rapidly. None of these versions is printed with the ordinary Arabic type, as the Mogrebi and Algerian characters are slightly different in shape; the natives read writing more easily than print, so these versions of the Scriptures were published from plates and are a faithful reproduction of the common writing of the country.

The Missionary Motive

A kind of dulness seems to have come over missionary work and there has not been in the rank and file of a church the awakening in missionary zeal which was expected after the Edinburgh Conference. In the *International Review of Missions* for January, 1914, Mr. T. R. Glover, writing on this theme, says that this is largely because of the influence of higher criticism and of the comparative study of religion. There is often in Christian circles an insidious growing notion that in all religions the essence is the same and this dilettant attitude is fatal to missionary enthusiasm, to say the least. Book knowledge of paganism has taken the place of implicit faith in stories told by the missionaries; we have learned to appreciate the beauty of certain pagan myths but we have forgotten that religion is a life and that heathenism as a system is immoral and degenerate. No man knew the African better than Livingstone, because no man has loved the African negro more than he, and he could write of his "intense disgust of paganism." Christianity is often imperfectly grasped, but unlike other religions Christianity contains a principle of regeneration and life. In the incarnation of the Son of God there is an ethical majesty which compels adoration and leads men to follow in the steps of Jesus Christ. The knowledge of redemption in Jesus Christ never fails to fill men with a longing to give the news of that redemption to the world; when they understand God's purpose for them they seem to enter to a great extent into God's purpose of love for the whole world. Nothing less than that can give birth to missionary enthusiasm or keep it alive. A curtailed theology and a watered-down faith will not do.

The University of Nanking

The University of Nanking, China, is supported by Presbyterians, Disciples, Methodists, and Baptists. It is located in a strategical position from the point of view of civilization and Christian enterprise. The university has developed preparatory and college courses leading to the A.B. degree. There is a teachers' training and normal school, a medical college, a language school for missionaries, and an agricultural settlement. A number of school-teachers of the old Chinese type take up special courses in Western science and pedagogy. Last year 48 teachers of the normal school became candidates for baptism, that showing how the Christian University of Nanking influence is far-reaching. Fifteen American graduates are on the staff of the collegiate schools, seven at the medical school, others take charge of other activities. Mr. C. H. Hamilton, of the University of Chicago, has been appointed professor of philosophy. Three graduates of this university are already on the staff of the University of Nanking.

Education of Women and Girls in India

Miss McDougall writes on some problems of education in India in the *International Review of Missions* for January, 1914. In 1907 only 7 per 1,000 of the women of India were able to read; but now there is a growing desire for education, so that it is no longer necessary to pay the girls for attending school. Education work is

carried on by three agencies: the educational service of the government, the missionary societies, and the various indigenous schools set up in the interest of reformed Hinduism. Government schools do not succeed very well; their so-called religious neutrality makes them anti-religious and Indian parents will rather send their daughters to mission schools where the teachers are more devoted and often more efficient. Not that the Indian parent has any wish that his daughter should become a Christian; but still less does he wish her to be irreligious. As for the Reformed Hindu schools, they are far below the schools under European management through lack of both experienced management and capable teachers. Although there is now a magnificent opportunity for the mission schools for girls, there are still many difficulties: the custom of early marriage removes the child from school just at the age when an independent intellectual life is awaking; such children, however, carry home the memory of a cultivated and friendly Christian woman teacher so that they will usually welcome the "*zenana*-lady" when she visits them in their homes. This custom of early marriage also cuts off at the root the supply of teachers; moreover the life of an isolated woman teacher, whether unmarried or widowed, is extremely difficult. Native teachers are usually Indian or Eurasian Christians, but they need the supervision of English teachers. Eurasian girls, however, are in large numbers Roman Catholics and, being trained by French nuns, remain to a great extent foreign to British ideals. Most schools are understaffed, and as a result many missionaries have failed to study the vernacular so thoroughly that they could convey religious teaching in the mother-tongue of their pupils. In some high schools the whole or a great part of the religious life of the pupils is conducted in this alien language (English), which of course is much to be regretted. It seems that if missionary societies could decide at an earlier stage to what work and country a candidate should be assigned, his preparation at home could be made more effective. Experience in a high school at home and a time of special training in the languages, religions, and characteristics of the Indian races would be a great help to the new missionaries. Too often pressure of work prevents them when once on the field from giving the necessary time to such studies.

BOOK NOTICES

Revelation and the Ideal. By George A. Gordon. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913. Pp. x+427. $1.50.

Although this is a collection of sermons, it has more of unity and compactness than ordinarily attach to homiletic volumes. The author describes it as his second choice, not his first. For many years, he cherished the design of writing a "Philosophy of Revelation." Long study and reflection, however, convinced him that the task required for its accomplishment the undivided devotion of a lifetime; and he was compelled to abandon the project of writing a systematic treatise. In place of a technical philosophic work, he now offers a series of visions relating to the moral possibilities of man. He is convinced that God enters into communion with men through the doorway of their Greater Ideals; and he views Revelation and the Ideal as the concave and convex of the same figure. The divine thought is sunk in the depths of the soul, where it lives and operates under the immediate pressure of the Divine Presence. The Ideal is the shadow of God in the mind of man. The word "revelation" carries its meaning in a metaphor. It means that the veil has been removed, as from the face of a person. The veil is not of God's manufacture. It is created by human ignorance and perversity. In lifting the veil of ignorance from the face of nature, the scientist is the servant of God and of man in the great process of revelation. But when the human mind opens to the moral ideal, and the streams of selfishness are dried up, God invades our being at its very center; and his character becomes a call for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Jesus, the supreme human soul, gives us the sovereign vision of God.

The Life of Jesus. By Alfred W. Martin. New York: Appleton, 1913. Pp. x+280. $1.50.

The author is a leader in the New York Society for Ethical Culture. The book studies Jesus "in the light of the higher criticism." Coming from a quarter whence the Christian public has been led to expect liberal manifestoes, this volume is a welcome sign of what may now be recognized as a world-wide reaction against extreme rationalistic and skeptical views of the life of Jesus. It presents nothing new. It cannot wholly satisfy professing Christians. Yet it will help to make Jesus real to many intelligent laymen who are outside the church, who are not easily reached through the regular ecclesiastical channels, and who are in doubt regarding the position which they should take toward the Founder of Christianity. Its primary purpose, as the author says, is not negative and iconoclastic—not to pick the New Testament to pieces, but rather to build up a knowledge of the truth so far as it is in our power to attain it. Following the course of modern critical study in this department, he depends chiefly upon the Synoptic Gospels, pointing out that allowance must be made, even here, for bias, or "tendency," on the part of the writers and compilers of the narratives. As an example of the author's reverent spirit, the following sentences bear witness: "What a gain it is to be able to substitute for the belief in a physical resurrection of Jesus (which *all* the gospels do not teach, neither does the apostle Paul), the fact that Jesus so lived as to have made his disciples certain of his immortality and of their own." "Such helpful conclusions are we entitled to form from even the negative results of the higher criticism, removing obstacles to rational faith and just judgment by showing us the real origin and character of the narratives in which the disturbing statements appear." Among the many modern Lives of Jesus which are secondary in rank, this book takes a respectable place.

The Continuation Committee Conferences in Asia 1912–1913. New York: Published by the Chairman of the Continuation Committee, 1913. Pp. 488. $2.00.

The great World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910 was more than a gathering of enthusiasts brought up for a short time to a white heat, to cool off as soon as the individuals composing it should separate. It was a momentous culmination, and a beginning. Its moving and directing power was to extend to all the missionary centers in the world, and to enter all unoccupied territory. In order that this might be done a continuation committee was appointed to carry forward the investigations begun by the eight commissions of the Edinburgh Conference, and "to preserve and extend its atmosphere and spirit." Mr. Mott as chairman was requested "to give a considerable portion of his time to the work of the committee, and its special committees; to visit mission fields; to acquaint missionaries and native leaders with the work and plans of the Continuation Committee; to study how missionary bodies on the field and their committee may be brought into mutually helpful relations."

The chairman with his usual industry and efficiency has carried out the suggestion of his colleagues. Twenty-one conferences have been held and this volume of 488 pages contains an

account of these conferences together with their findings and lists of members. The subjects were: "Occupation"; "Evangelization"; "The Christian Church"; "Christian Leadership"; "The Training of Missionaries"; "Christian Education"; "Christian Literature"; "Co-operation"; "Medical Work"; "Women's Work"; "Occasional Topics."

An excellent analytical table of contents enables the student to refer at once to all that was done at each of the conferences on these several subjects. There are also an appendix, an index, and four illustrations. All Christians will rejoice at this indispensable step forward in the scientific study of the greatest of all subjects.

Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti V pont. max. jussu recognita et Clementis VIII auctoritate edita. By M. Hetzenauer. New York: Fr. Pustet & Co., 1914. Pp. xx+1,280. $3.00.

In 1906, Hetzenauer gave to scholars the best existing edition of the Vulgate. That was an expensive book, costing about five dollars; and it was primarily an edition for specialists by reason of the form in which it was presented and the subsidiary matter it contained. It was thus effectually out of reach of the common man, even if he could read Latin. The present edition is relatively cheap and it contains comparatively little but the biblical text itself. This more popular edition reaps the benefits of all the author's exhaustive studies for the more learned edition. The text of the new work contains a few corrections of errors discovered in the earlier work since its issue. While the text of the first edition was printed in double columns on the page, the lines of this run across the unbroken page. That was as near as possible a facsimile of the type of the original official edition; this one is set on a monotype machine. The paper is of the thin, opaque, and tough character rendered so familiar by its use in the Oxford Bibles. The side margins carry brief notations summarizing the contents of the successive sections; and footnotes give the official list of parallel passages. The whole constitutes a very useful and handy edition—the most satisfactory for general purposes yet published.

A thoroughly critical edition of the Vulgate is yet a desideratum. This edition and its predecessor aim at nothing more than an accurate reproduction of the Latin text as officially approved by Pope Clement VIII on the basis of the earlier edition of Pope Sixtus V. But a long history of the Vulgate text from the days of Jerome to the time of Sixtus has to be reckoned with. Critical processes cannot stop short of any goal other than the original text. The very first principle laid down by Hetzenauer for his guidance in all of his critical work sounds very strange in the ears of textual critics, viz., "that reading is indeed official, which the Roman *correctorium* offers, though it may appear in only one public edition, or even in none, because this *correctorium* was composed under the authority of the *Summus Pontifex*." But within the limits thus set for himself, Hetzenauer has worked carefully and diligently; and he is therefore entitled to the gratitude and praise of all scholars. Hetzenauer himself knows the nature and difficulty of the task to be done in the recovery of the original text of Jerome to which the official papal commission of the Benedictines has set itself. Nobody knows it better; and it is because of the inevitably long delay before the appearance of that edition that he has thought it desirable to reissue the Clementine text in this form.

The Prophets of Israel from the Eighth to the Fifth Century. Their Faith and Their Message. By Moses Buttenwieser. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. xxii+350. $2.00.

Books on the prophets by the descendants of the prophets are surprisingly few. The great bulk of modern scholarly work in this field has been done by Gentiles. This volume is therefore entitled to consideration. Its author is a believer in the historical method and thus goes at his work free of all prejudice. The book is not lacking in new opinions and some of them are startlingly new. The appeal of the book is on the whole to the scholar; parts of it are such as to interest the layman, but they constitute a small proportion of the work. This is but the first volume of a two-volume book. This volume concerns itself with the Faith of the Prophets; but the Message of the Prophets which is to be the burden of Vol. II is given in the last chapter of Vol. I. This analysis of the subject-matter will inevitably involve considerable repetition. Furthermore, the logic of the arrangement within Vol. I is hard to discover; the general impression left by a reading of it is confusion. Another displeasing feature to English readers is the spelling. Why depart from such familiar forms as Canaan, Carmel, etc., for Kanaan, Karmel, etc.? Jehoiakim yields to Jehojakim, Gemariah to Gemarjah, Micaiah ben Imlah to Micajah ben Jimlah, etc. Sometimes the divine name is rendered by "Lord" and sometimes by YHWH. "Winckler" is everywhere spelled "Winkler." "Holmes and Parsons" loses the final "s."

Among the new things, we find the contention that Jeremiah, the prophet, could not write. The only evidence urged in support of it is the fact that he dictated his oracles to Baruch, instead of writing them himself. This seems far from convincing; other considerations would seem to call for attention before we take refuge n this explanation of Baruch's service. It is

true that "and I wrote" in Jer., chap. 36, is used of writing by proxy; it does not follow, however, that the same explanation holds good of 32:10. There is no evidence that in Jeremiah's day the transfer of real estate had to be officially recorded even as today. Nor would such a recorder, if he existed, write out the deed for the owner; his business concerns the deed only after it has been drawn up. Hence the natural explanation of Jer. 32:10 is that Jeremiah wrote out the deed with his own hand.

Still another novelty is this view that Deut. 18:22 is aimed at prophets like Amos, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, who belittle the ritual. This, however, rests upon a translation of the verse which is not well sustained, but most unnatural, and which makes the lawmakers write ambiguously when the language furnished easy means for expressing themselves unambiguously. But a more serious perversion of facts is represented by the view that the prophets never expected to effect any change in the hearts of the people to whom they preached, but went forth firmly convinced that doom was inevitable. This makes the whole activity of the prophets little more than a farce. What is the use of repeated calls to repentance, if one knows in advance that they will be of no effect? Such activity on the part of prophets is psychologically inconceivable. What human being could find satisfaction in a work whose utter ineffectiveness was known from the moment of its inception? The utterances of the prophets read like those of men whose heart was in their work and whose spirits ebbed and flowed with the tides of hope and despair like those of other men.

In the detailed analysis of portions of the prophetic literature which this volume contains, there are many points of interest and suggestiveness which will repay careful consideration. On the whole, however, the work is one for the sifting of scholars, rather than the uncritical acceptance of mere readers.

The Larger Aspects of Socialism. By William E. Walling. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xxi+406. $1.50.

Mr. Walling is already known as a writer upon socialistic topics, having published only a few years ago a volume on *Socialism as It Is*. The present volume is, in a way, complementary to its predecessor and is possibly of equal importance. In it Mr. Walling presents socialism as something very much more significant than an economic device, protests against the development of a fighting class-consciousness as serving simply to perpetuate some of the evils of the present capitalistic order, repudiates collectivism and pleads for that which he believes socialism really to be—a concrete movement under the domination of certain great principles which is to remake the social order and out from which shall evolve something which no mere a priori theory can forecast. This movement is to recast religion and all social institutions.

For those who have been content to look upon socialism as a mere matter of economics this volume will come as a distinct shock. It will serve as ammunition of the opponents of socialism, because Mr. Walling is so absolutely ingenuous in setting forth the real things which the socialists as partakers of the movement have in mind. It will be surprising if one can rise from the reading of this volume without feeling that a Christian man must be very discriminating in his pursuit of the ideals of socialism. If Mr. Walling be correct, and it is difficult to see how he can be proved incorrect by appeal to the great tide of creative socialistic literature, we have in socialism something which frankly proposes the end of many institutions quite other than those of mere capitalism.

A reading of the chapter upon socialism and religion, to say nothing about the chapter dealing with socialism and women, will be likely to disillusion men who have been following certain socialistic writers who claim that socialism has nothing to do with religion and the family.

We commend this book to all our readers because it sets forth with absolute distinctness a view of the world and reconstructive forces now at work.

The New Era in Asia. By Sherwood Eddy. New York: Missionary Education Movement, 1913. Pp. xiv+215. 50 cents.

The position of the author, as a conspicuous leader in the present missionary campaign, gives this book peculiar value and authority. He compares the awakening of Asia to the awakening of Europe in modern times, with the difference that the transformation of the East is going on much more rapidly than has that of the West, and affects a vastly greater population. The author finds that the renaissance of Europe consists of five factors—political, intellectual, economic, social, and religious. He follows out the influence of the same factors in Asia, taking up in succession Japan, Korea, China, India, and the Near East, concluding with a chapter on the new era in world missions. Sixteen reproductions from photographs are scattered through the work. We are glad to commend this book as heartily as we have the other volumes published by the Missionary Education Movement. It will be noticed that the price of all issues in the series is remarkably low. This volume by Mr. Eddy can be had in paper covers for thirty-five cents. It should have a wide circulation.

Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman. By Wilfrid Ward. New York: Longmans, 1913. Two vols., pp. 1,281. $4.50.

The volumes before us are a new impression following two English and two American editions

of this able and scholarly biography. Newman could ask no better exhibit of his life and work. Mr. Ward's narrative is based on the private journals and correspondence of the Cardinal; and in the text he reproduces a large amount of material from these copious documents. Sympathetic without being too enthusiastic, temperate and kindly in tone, the author seems to have exhausted the subject. The work is a contribution to the psychology of Christianity in the nineteenth century; and it affords another proof that the best way to study history is the biographical method. This *Life*, together with Morley's *Gladstone*, Trevelyan's *John Bright*, and a few other works of a similar character, would suffice to tell the tale of modern England.

The gifted author of "Lead Kindly Light" has been much misunderstood. Superficial detractors have represented him as a person of weak and uncertain mind, who hardly knew what to believe, and who, groping "amid the encircling gloom," finally prostrated himself before the papal throne, and said, "Tell me what to believe." This is so far from being a true statement of the case that it is almost a caricature. To read these volumes is to respect Newman, whether one can agree with his presuppositions and conclusions or not. Born in 1801, he remained in the Church of England until he was forty-four years of age. But by 1828, he had begun to be conscious of a "mission." This mission was one of relentless warfare against that liberalism in thought which was breaking up ancient institutions in church and state, and which, in the somber imagination of the young scholar, would not cease from its destructive work until it had swept religion off the earth and converted our planet into a vast wilderness of atheism.

The first form which Newman's campaign assumed was the famous "Oxford Movement." He aimed thereby to strengthen the English church as the home of dogmatic religion by imparting intellectual depth to its traditional theology and spiritual life to its institutions, and by rewelding the almost broken links which bound Anglicanism to the Church Universal. Followers crowded to his banner; and by 1838 his influence in Oxford University and far beyond was extraordinary. But his thought sped on. He came to believe that the Church of England itself had been unfaithful to that very catholic, or universal, tradition which he was trying to recover as the defense against rationalistic Liberalism. Newman was but one of many who followed the same course. For minds constituted like his, Rome was inevitable. Granting that his view of science is right, then the Roman dogma and the widespread, close-knit organization of the papal army afford the best means of combating those phases of modern thought which are deplored alike by Protestant and Catholic. But there is no probability, and scarcely a possibility, that Protestants in any considerable numbers will walk in the path which Newman trod. He lived in an age that has passed away.

Rev. Bernhard Pick has collated an interesting and useful pamphlet entitled *Jesus in the Talmud* (Open Court Publishing Co., 75 cents). The little book takes up the personality, the disciples, and the sayings of Jesus, as viewed from the standpoint of ancient Judaism. The utterances of the Talmud must not be misunderstood, says the author; nor should they be overestimated. They are not based on contemporary evidence; and thus they possess no historic value. They are the expression of a non-Christian spirit, mostly hostile and sometimes positively offensive. They are material for the scholar, and must not in any sense be considered as popular reading. Hence the author wisely says that the reader must use the pamphlet with discretion, and must bear in mind the conditions existing in the age in which these utterances concerning Jesus were written.

Under the title *Praying for the Dead*, Rev. R. J. E. Boggis, vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Barnstaple, England, presents an interesting historical review of the practice (Longmans, $1.25). He sketches the antiquity and extent of prayers for the dead, the evidence from Judaism and Christianity, concluding with an expression of hope that the Anglican church, together with Protestantism in general, will incline more favorably to this usage, and in course of time will be at one with Catholicism in valuing and using intercession for the departed.

The conclusions of a conference of headmasters and teachers in secondary schools with reference to the Scriptures in boys' work are published in *The Use of the Bible among Schoolboys* (Association Press, New York, 75 cents). Chapter headings: "The Purpose of Bible-Study"; "Curriculum Bible Courses"; "Books Available for Curriculum Courses"; "The Use of the Scriptures in Chapel Services"; "The Initiative of Boys in Bible Study"; "Methods and Courses for Voluntary Study." The book is one which all who are engaged in school work with boys will value.

A collection of *Twelve Parochial Sermons*, by the late Professor J. E. B. Mayor, of Cambridge (Cambridge University Press, $1.00), gives a good illustration of a scholar's ability to preach in a style wholly adapted to the religious needs of an ordinary church congregation.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. IX

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

This course is published in ten leaflets issued on the fifteenth of each month from September, 1913, to June, 1914. It is sent free to all members of the AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE *enrolling for this course. Membership in the* INSTITUTE *may be secured by sending the annual membership fee of fifty cents and four cents for postage to the headquarters of the* INSTITUTE, *at the University of Chicago.*

STUDY VIII

CHAPTER XIII

PLEAS OF CHURCH LEADERS FOR CHRISTIAN LOYALTY IN FACE OF TEMPTATIONS AND PERSECUTIONS. FIRST PETER, HEBREWS, JAMES, JUDE, SECOND PETER, AND REVELATION

First day.—§ 81. *The author, purpose, and general character of this group of books:* The First Epistle of Peter entire. Modern scholars are in great uncertainty as to the authorship of these writings. The names of Peter, Paul, James, and Judas (the two brothers of Jesus), and the apostle John have long been connected with them. Hebrews is really anonymous, the Revelation does not describe its author John, nor does James identify its author. First and Second Peter clearly claim to have been written by the apostle, but the actual authorship of these letters and of Jude is somewhat in doubt, that of Second Peter and Jude being especially so. The books evidently arose in an early period of the Christian church, but not at the very beginning. With the possible exception of James, they are all undoubtedly later than Paul.

It is evident, from the contents, that they were written in a time of grave danger to the church and all that it holds dear, to correct errors in the church, to fortify the members against temptation and persecution, and to insure a deeper faith in Christianity as the final and all-sufficient religion.

Read now, as a first example of this type of literature, I Pet. 1:1—3:12 (leaving 3:13 to end for the next day), carefully following the analysis given below. Note: (*a*) the circumstances under which Peter is said to have written (reading "Rome" for "Babylon"); (*b*) the various dangers and trials to which the friends were exposed; (*c*) the argument by which he seeks to comfort and encourage them; and, especially, (*d*) the splendid faith of the author, who seems himself already to have passed through similar crises, with honor. Do not fail to look up all the Old Testament passages which the author quotes as his authority.

Second day.—Read I Pet. 3:15—5:14, following the analysis and the suggestions given above. The remarkable passage in 3:19, 20 is based on the so-called Book of Enoch (60:5, 25–64; 69:26, in the edition of R. H. Charles).

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

I. Introduction (1:1–12).
   1. Salutation (1:1, 2).
   2. Ascription of praise to God for the salvation brought through Christ, with special emphasis on the glory to be revealed (1:3–12).

II. The body of the letter; general exhortations (1:13—5:11).
   1. To set their hope on this coming salvation and to live holy lives, as those redeemed by Christ's blood and begotten by the word of God (1:13–25).
   2. To put away all wickedness and be built up a spiritual house as God's elect people (2:1–10).
   3. To live righteously in all the relations of life, that thus criticism may be silenced and men may glorify God (2:11—3:12).
   4. To live righteously even under persecution; enforced by the example of Christ (3:13—4:6).
   5. To live soberly and in love in view of the nearness of the end (4:7–11).
   6. To endure persecution for righteousness, but not to suffer as evil-doers (4:12–19).
   7. To the elders, to care for the flock; to the younger, to be in subjection; to all, to live humbly and watchfully (5:1–11).

III. Conclusion; salutations, and benediction (5:12–14).

Third day.—§ 82. *The Epistle to the Hebrews:* Notice (Heb. 1:1) that the letter to the Hebrews begins without salutation, name of writer, or of persons addressed. In the oldest MSS the title of the letter is simply "To the Hebrews," without the name of Paul which stands at the head of the letter in our Bibles. Heb. 13:23 indicates that the writer was some friend of Timothy, but who he was is unknown. Read Heb. 3:6*b*–15; 4:14; 6:4–8; 10:23–39, and note the evidence they furnish that the letter was written when some had fallen away from faith in Christ, and for the purpose of preventing such apostasy among those to whom the letter was written. Look through the analysis below and see whether it sustains these statements.

ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

I. Doctrinal portion of the letter (1:1—10:18).
   1. Theme of the letter: revelation of God through Christ superior to all that preceded it (1:1–3).
   2. Proof (1:4—10:18).
      a) The Son better than angels (1:4—2:18).
      b) Jesus our high priest superior to all that preceded (3:1—10:18).
         (1) Better than Moses (3:1–6).
         (2) Digression: exhortation to steadfastness (3:7—4:16).
         (3) The priesthood of Christ real and legitimate (5:1–10).
         (4) Digression second. Reproof of the readers for dulness, and warning of the fate of those who having made some progress fall away (5:11—6:20).

(5) Christ a priest after the order of Melchizedek (chap. 7).
(i) Description of Melchizedek (7:1–3).
(ii) Superiority of his priesthood to that of Aaron shown in that Levi in the loins of Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek (7:4–10).
(iii) The superiority of Christ's priesthood to that of Levi shown in that it displaces the Levitical, and is declared with an oath to be eternal (7:11–25).
(iv) The excellences of Christ's priesthood summed up (7:26–28).
(6) The priesthood of Christ is the real, the heavenly, of which the Levitical is only the shadow (8:1—10:18).
(i) This proposition emphatically asserted (8:1, 2).
(ii) Proof that it is heavenly, since he is a priest, yet is not of the earthly (Levitical) order (8:3–5).
(iii) This argument enforced by one concerning the covenants; while the old stood it was declared to be only temporary, to be displaced by another; of this new one Christ is the mediator (8:6–13).
(iv) The earthly and heavenly tabernacle and service are compared and shown to have the correspondence appropriate to their relation as type and antitype (9:1–22).
(v) The comparison of the two priesthoods made in detail, that of Christ being shown to be the permanent and real, the Levitical, the temporary, the copy, and the shadow (9:23—10:18).

II. Hortatory portion of the letter (10:19—12:25).
1. Exhortation to steadfast faith (10:19—12:29).
a) Exhortation to steadfastness based on the nature of the salvation already described (10:19–25).
b) Enforced by the consequences of apostasy (10:26–31).
c) Enforced by appeal to their previous endurance (10:32–39).
d) Old Testament examples of faith (chap. 11).
e) Renewed exhortation enforced by appeal to these witnesses and to the example of Christ (12:1–3).
f) Enforced by the consideration that persecution is God's chastening of us as sons (12:4–13).
g) Further warning against apostasy, enforced by reference to Esau (12:14–17).
h) Further enforced by appeal to the difference between the old convenant and the new (12:18–29).
2. More general exhortation, and final words (chap. 13).

Fourth day.—Read Heb. 1:1–3. Cf. the analysis and note what these verses imply (*a*) as to the writer's view of the Old Testament religion, (*b*) as to his conception of the relation of the new religion to the old. Read 1:4–14 (cf. analysis). Read 2:1–4. This is the first of a number of parenthetical exhortations in the letter and shows that though the letter has more of the form of a treatise than any other New Testament letter, yet its purpose is decidedly practical. Read also 2:5–18, noticing that the writer argues first that the Old Testament language

about Man and the Son of Man is perfectly fulfilled only in Jesus, and second, that the Old Testament represents Christ as speaking of men as his brethren.

Fifth day.—Read chaps. 3 and 4 with the help of the analysis. On 3:7–19 cf. suggestion on 2:1–4.

Sixth day.—Read 5:1—6:20 (cf. analysis).

Seventh day.—Read chap. 7 (cf. analysis).

Eighth day.—Read 8:1—9:22 (cf. analysis).

Ninth day.—Read 9:23—10:18 (cf. analysis). Review with the analysis the doctrinal portion of the letter, noticing how all the argument aims to show that while the Old Testament religion is from God, the New, which came in through Christ, is *better*, and how all the exhortation is to constancy and faith, and against apostasy. What does this imply as to the persons addressed? Were they of Jewish or gentile birth—were they Christians or persons whom the author desired to convert? To what danger were they exposed? What is the evident purpose of the whole?

Tenth day.—Read 10:19—11:40. Notice especially the relation of this familiar eleventh chapter to the argument and purpose of the whole letter (cf. analysis).

Eleventh day.—Read chaps. 12 and 13 (cf. analysis). Can you not feel the deep earnestness of the author as, with argument completed, he turns in passionate appeal to those who are tempted to leave the Christian faith for ways which can never lead to God? Whether or not we can today agree with all the author's arguments, we cannot but admire the devotion of men such as he to their religion and the energy and ability with which they defended it.

Twelfth day.—§ 83. *The Epistle of James.* The structure of this letter is very simple: just a succession of practical topics. Try to make an analysis for yourself. Make also a list of the dangers the author is trying to meet, and another list of the incentives which he so assuringly brings to bear upon those who may be weaker than himself in the Christian faith. How deep a religious life must such an author possess?

Thirteenth day.—§ 84. *The Epistle of Jude.* On the occasion and purpose of this letter see Jude, vss. 3, 4. See Acts 20:29, 30; Phil. 3:18, 19; II Tim. 3:1–13; 4:3, 4, for evidence that before the writing of this letter corrupting tendencies already existed in the church, and it had been foreseen that they would develop still further. Read Jude, vs. 4, again, noticing the particular character of the corruption which is referrred to in this passage. Notice how the author masses his phrases of condemnation against the vile sins of sexual abuse, sodomy, greed, and the like! Vss. 12, 13 are evidently taken from the Book of Enoch.

Fourteenth day.—§ 85. *The Second Epistle of Peter.* Read chap. 2, comparing the letter of Jude and observing the evidence (*a*) that the writer of this letter feared that the corrupt men already at work among those to whom Jude wrote will presently be at work among those to whom he himself was now writing, (*b*) that the writer of Second Peter drew his description of the false teachers from the earlier letter. Read chap. 1 (cf. analysis), noticing especially in vss. 1–11 the strong emphasis upon the necessity of growth in knowledge and character, and in vss. 12–21 the substantial basis, historical and prophetical, upon which Christianity rests. Read 2:1—3:13, noticing the kind of skepticism here combated, and the practical bearing (vs. 11) of the counter teaching. Read 3:14–18, noticing the

emphasis upon steadfastness and growth in knowledge (cf. 1:5–8), and the suggestion of relation between them.

Fifteenth day.—§ 86. *The Book of Revelation.* Read chap. 1, and answer the following questions: (1) What is the general character of this book as compared with that of other New Testament books (vs. 1)? (Name the different classes of books contained in the New Testament and consider whether there are any others which belong to the same class with this.) (2) Who is the reputed author of the book? (3) From whom and how did he claim to have received its contents? (4) Where was he when he received it? (5) To whom was it addressed? (Consult a map respecting the places named in vs. 11.) (6) Who is referred to in vss. 12–19, and what conception of him does the vision represent?

ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION

I. Prologue (chap. 1).
   1. Title of the book (1:1–3).
   2. Salutation and doxology (1:4–8).
   3. The seer's vision of the giver of the Revelation (1:9–20).

II. Messages to the seven churches (chaps. 2, 3).
   1. To the church in Ephesus (2:1–7).
   2. To the church in Smyrna (2:8–11).
   3. To the church in Pergamum (2:12–17).
   4. To the church in Thyatira (2:18–29).
   5. To the church in Sardis (3:1–6).
   6. To the church in Philadelphia (3:7–13).
   7. To the church in Laodicea (3:14–22).

III. The seven seals (4:1—8:1).
   1. Prelude: the seer's vision of heaven (chaps. 4, 5).
   2. The opening of the first six seals (chap. 6).
   3. Episode: the sealing of the servants of God before the seventh seal is opened (chap. 7).
   4. The seventh seal opened. The signal for the seven trumpets (8:1).

IV. The seven trumpets (8:2—14:20).
   1. Prelude to the sounding of the seven trumpets (8:2–5).
   2. The first four trumpets (chap. 8).
   3. The fifth and sixth trumpets: the first and second woes (chap. 9).
   4. Episode: prelude to the sounding of the seventh trumpet (10:1—11:14).
   5. The seventh trumpet: the third woe (11:15—14:20).

V. The seven bowls of plagues (15:1—19:10).
   1. Prelude to the pouring-out of the seven bowls (chap. 15).
   2. The seven bowls poured out (chap. 16).
   3. Continued description of the seventh bowl: the fall of Babylon (17:1—19:10).

VI. The victory of Christ (with 19:11 cf. 6:2) (19:11—22:5).
   1. The vision of the rider of the white horse (19:11–16).
   2. The feast of the birds of prey (19:17, 18).
   3. The overthrow of the powers of evil (19:19–21).
   4. The binding of Satan (20:1–3).

5. The millennium and the great judgment (20:4–15).
6. The new heaven and the new earth (21:1–8).
7. The vision of the bride, and of the new Jerusalem (21:9—22:5).

VII. Epilogue (22:6–21).

Sixteenth day.—Read chap. 2, studying in detail the four letters here given. Form as clear an idea as you can of the moral condition of these churches. What peculiar errors and dangers are here pointed out to them? Note the threats and promises to each. In plain language what do these statements mean? What ideal of the true church is implied in each case?

Seventeenth day.—Study the remaining three letters in chap. 3 in similar fashion, noting details as above.

Eighteenth day.—Read chap. 4 (cf. analysis), seeking rather to gain an impression of the heavenly worship of Jehovah set forth in this chapter, than to determine the significance of each group of beings or of the numbers, which are, of course, of symbolic rather than numerical significance. Read also chap. 5, and compare the worship offered to Jehovah in the previous chapter and that offered to Christ in this chapter.

Nineteenth day.—Read chap. 6 (cf. analysis). Read vss. 1 and 2 and cf. 19:11–16 as showing who is meant by "him that sitteth on the white horse." Notice that in chap. 6 he goes forth conquering and to conquer, but before his conquest is complete (cf. 19:16) some other things must happen. To see what these are read vss. 3–17. Some have thought that, interpreting the red horse to mean war, the black horse famine, and the pale horse death, the vision of the fifth seal martyrdom, and of the sixth seal the overthrow of Christ's enemies (cf. the words of Jesus, Matt. 24:6–13 and Luke 21:10–19), this chapter contains in brief the main thought of the whole book, viz., that though evil is a mighty force in the world, and though there must be conflict, persecution, and catastrophe before the end come, yet in the end Christ shall triumph over all and with him those that in faith endure to the end.

Twentieth day.—Read chap. 7 (cf. analysis). On the thought of the whole chapter, see Matt. 24:22, 31 concerning the protection and salvation of the elect amid all disasters.

Twenty-first day.—Read chap. 8 (cf. analysis). Notice that the seventh seal has no content of its own, but is only the signal for the seven trumpets and that the successive trumpets are the signals for successive disasters. Read also chap. 9 (cf. analysis). There have been many interpretations of this chapter, but what is most certain is that it describes some of the woes which the writer believed must befall the earth before the kingdom of heaven shall fully triumph.

Twenty-second day.—Read chap. 10 (cf. analysis), and notice that, as between the sixth and seventh seals an episode is introduced, so here between the sixth and seventh trumpets there is an episode of which this chapter is the first part. As to the meaning of this part of the episode recall the reference to the sealed book in chap. 5, and notice that it is now opened, and is given to the seer that sees the vision and that he is then bidden to prophesy. Read 11:1–13 (cf. analysis). Notice that, whatever else may be the meaning of this chapter, the thought so constantly presented in the Revelation appears here also, that though the enemies of God seem to triumph, in the end it is not so. Read 11:14–19 (cf. analysis),

observing that vs. 14 announces a third woe, but that the description of the woes does not follow immediately, but instead there is a proclamation of the full triumph of God's kingdom which is to follow those woes.

Twenty-third day.—Chaps. 12, 13, 14 are best understood as a description of the conflicts between the church (or the kingdom) and Satan, and of the full triumph of the kingdom of God over the kingdom of evil (cf. 12:9 and 20:2). With this in mind read chaps. 12 and 13.

Twenty-fourth day.—Read chap. 14, which sets forth especially the salvation of God's people and the overthrow of his enemies.

Twenty-fifth day.—Read chap. 15 (cf. analysis), noticing that while vs. 1 announces the seven plagues which constitute the third woe announced by the seventh angel (11:14, 15), just as the seven trumpets furnished the contents of the seventh seal (cf. 8:1), yet the actual pouring-out of the bowls is still delayed a little until once more the triumph of the people of God is announced (15:2–4). Read chap. 16, which in the seven plagues pictures the full judgment of God upon the wicked (cf. 15:1).

Twenty-sixth day.—Read chap. 17, a continuation of the description of the seventh plague. Babylon is undoubtedly a symbolic name suggested by Old Testament prophecy (Isa. 21:9, for example), and whether referring especially to Rome or Jerusalem it symbolizes the organized powers of the world, hostile to the kingdom of God.

Twenty-seventh day.—Read chap. 18 (cf. analysis). See suggestions for yesterday. Read 19:1–10 (cf. analysis).

Twenty-eighth day.—Read 19:11—20:3 (cf. analysis).

Twenty-ninth day.—Read 20:4—21:8 (cf. analysis).

Thirtieth day.—Read 21:9—22:21 (cf. analysis). Note how, in these last two chapters, the controlling thought of the book is emphasized by pictures of the perfect peace and happiness which succeed the long descriptions of dreadful conflict and carnage. Note also the solemn, final warnings and invitations such as the teaching of the book suggests, and the closing emphasis upon the importance of this revelation. Although time and experience have clearly proved that the oriental details of this "Revelation," like those so vividly portrayed in similar books such as "Daniel" and "Enoch," can by no means be regarded as authoritative for our religious thinking, yet must we, and Christians of all ages, regard with reverence the sacred convictions of these struggling heroes of an age long since passed. We must forever lay aside the spirit of hatred and vengeance which, in those days, was very naturally drawn out by merciless persecutions; but we are under still greater obligation to appreciate, both in thought and by daily living, all the abiding truths which these brethren discovered at so great cost, in the depths of their human experience, and to emulate the faith which in the darker hours still believes in the triumph of God's kingdom.

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME XLIII JUNE 1914 NUMBER 6

LEAKING AT THE TOP

Ships leak at the bottom. Institutions leak at the top. With them the best rises and tends to escape unless properly conserved. The modern church as an institution is subject to this danger. It is losing young and vicarious idealists who are ready to sacrifice for the Cause of Jesus, but who believe that his Cause can better be served in some other institution than the church. And yet they are also children of a Mother who, they feel, cannot wisely employ them. They are our social workers, our playground directors, our municipal reformers, and practically all other leaders in the struggle for larger social good.

Ask these young men and women why they are not identified with some church and they will answer you frankly. They believe they can do more good in organizations which have more definitely practical purposes and demand no profession of religious belief.

This answer is not a protest against orthodoxy. Such men and women are found no more universally in "liberal" churches than in orthodox. Their self-imposed ostracism is born of something deeper than the unwillingness to subscribe to creeds. Their impulses are Christian, but theologically they are agnostics.

Why is the church losing these men and women?

Partly because they have been told by preachers that they cannot accept science and be Christians.

Partly because the churches with which some of them are acquainted have been controlled by men without knowledge or sympathy with education, who prefer preachers who are theologically as narrow-minded as themselves.

Partly because they have never been taught to think their religion in terms of their best thinking. Therefore, they believe

themselves to be more out of touch with the church than they really are. They despair of its future because they do not understand its present.

Partly, one might almost say largely, because they are themselves spiritually indifferent. In many cases they are altruistic materialists. Religion they hold to be a survival of primitive days and to be subordinate to ethics. They hold that it is useless to preach the gospel to men with empty stomachs, and therefore prefer to help people get good housing and good jobs rather than a sustaining faith in God and immortality.

But whatever may be the reasons for the loss of these efficient workers, the churches should at least be as much interested in them as in the leaders across the seas. It has a mission at home to those that are neither dependent, defective, nor delinquent. Why should the church be indifferent to men and women simply because they are strong and influential? A religion or any phase of a religion which cannot satisfy the intellectual life of its time is as surely doomed as a religion which cannot master the conscience of its time. One does not need to know much history to see this.

What shall the church do to prevent the loss of these modern men and women?

For one thing, its teachers and preachers must live in today's thinking. Homiletical cleverness, oratorical persuasiveness, ecclesiastical authority will not avail with men and women whose eyes have once been used in a methodical search for truth. Such honesty may bring its possessor bitter experiences, misrepresentation, loss of position, but the honesty quite as truly as the blood of martyrs has been the seed of the living church.

Either Christianity will compel the assent of honest men of modern training, or it is doomed to become in America what it is in Europe: the patron and protégé of ignorance.

Great causes can be hindered by little men. In its zeal to save the world, let the church not forget to save its own saviors.

SURVEY OF THE RELATION OF THE CHURCHES TO STATE UNIVERSITIES

PRESENTED TO THE CONFERENCE OF CHURCH WORKERS IN STATE UNIVERSITIES, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, FEBRUARY 3 TO 5, 1914

RICHARD C. HUGHES, D.D.
Secretary for University Work, the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church, Madison, Wisconsin

Any report on the religious life and work in state universities and state colleges made at present must be somewhat incomplete. There is no standard accepted, either by the churches or by the universities, by which to satisfactorily determine religious conditions. The enterprise of the churches in providing directly for the religious needs of the students is new and has not yet reached all the institutions, and only a few of these keep records that give information regarding the religious life of either faculty or students.

To secure material for this report one person at each of the eighty-five state universities and colleges was asked to make a careful study. The men selected were in a position to reach both the university authorities and the local churches, and they were supplied with carefully prepared blanks on which to make the report. At the time this report is written returns have been received from 50 institutions. Some have replied that the information asked for could not be secured; others made no reply.

This survey is undertaken with two assumptions: first, that religion is a necessary part of all education and that any system of education that makes no provision for religion is defective; second, that the separation of church and state places such limitations upon a state institution that it is unable to make the adequate provision for the religious needs of students which is required without the co-operation of the churches. The restrictions imposed by the laws and customs of the states vary greatly, and some institutions take advantage of the restrictions and pay slight attention to religion, while others take advantage of favoring conditions and make provision for a limited amount of religious instruction; but it is understood that even under the most favorable conditions the state may not do all that is required.

The three factors in the problem are: (1) the university, (2) the voluntary Student Associations, (3) the churches. It must be taken for granted that no array of statistics can portray the spiritual forces at work, for as there are powers of evil working in darkness, so there are influences for good that are

unseen and unknown except in their effects, and these effects are so far-reaching that they cannot be gathered up in a report; but there are facts and tendencies which can be discovered and which need to be known if there is to be a solution of what is acknowledged to be a most difficult problem, namely, the maintenance of state-supported education without the sacrifice of religious ideals.

Providing for the religious needs of students should include public worship, instruction in the Bible and other religious subjects, counsel in personal religion and choice of vocation, and training for and practice in Christian social service.

1. The University

These state universities are fine examples of social service for the good of the community. It is a genuine religious motive which prompts this service, even when it is not openly recognized by those rendering the service. The churches have inspired the public with the religious spirit until it has come to pass that cities, counties, and states are maintaining institutions which were once left entirely to the churches, such as hospitals, charities of many sorts, and schools, from the kindergarten to the university. The great public-school system is a monument to the power of religion and an evidence of the success of the churches. If in the administration the religious spirit becomes lost, this is due to some serious neglect which should be corrected; it is not due to the genius of the system itself. As an example of this, one of the state universities was founded by a church which later gave over to the state the entire property under an agreement that the state would forever maintain on that campus a college of liberal arts. A reading of the history of this transaction will convince anyone that the church entered into this agreement because it regarded a college of liberal arts as a distinctively religious institution, and it made no provision for the teaching of religious subjects or for public worship. Under state control this particular institution has lost the traditions of the founders. In most universities the connection of the church is not so clearly traced as in this one instance, but back of all of them is the same influence. Whenever a public school or university has lost its interest in the churches and in definite religious instruction, it will usually be found that the churches are at fault, in that they have ceased to inspire the institution with the religious spirit.

The contribution of these institutions to the improvement of social, industrial, and economic conditions and the unselfish service rendered in research laboratory, experiment station, and classroom, by men who might by the same labor gain personal wealth, has a definite religious value.

The attention given to the development of the physical life of the students in the modern university gymnasium, the thorough physical examination, the counsel given as to physical habits, the training intended to overcome physical defects and harmoniously to develop the body, is a necessary part of religious education. Many of the state universities have developed this line of work to a point of high efficiency and

have established a standard which the churches would do well to follow in their care of young people. One of the state universities employs a staff of twenty-five instructors in athletics and physical culture in addition to the medical staff. The public is informed about competitive athletics, but has not yet learned the extent to which these institutions are increasing their interest in and provision for the physical training of each individual student.

In some institutions there are courses offered in religious subjects. There are not many of these courses, and the number of students taking them is very small when compared with the total number. The significant fact in this connection is that if some state universities have found a way by which the material of religion may be taught from the point of view of scholarship without prejudice for or against any church, there would seem to be no reason why the amount and value of this instruction should not be increased.

When the churches co-operate in providing instruction for religious values, they will make it easier for the state to provide curriculum courses in the biblical languages and literature and in the history, psychology, and philosophy of religion for scholarship values.

In a few instances university credit is given for courses in religion provided by the churches on independent foundations. How far this type of work is to develop is an open question of real interest. It has gone far enough to make clear two things: first, that the instruction should be given in an organized school or college which is definitely affiliated with the university, so that the work may have proper supervision; and second, that the distinction between curriculum and religious values be kept clearly in mind. It is possible to teach the material of religion without teaching religion.

Examples of what may be done on independent foundations affiliated with the state universities are Wesley College at the University of North Dakota, the Association of Religious Teachers in the University of Texas, and the Christian Bible Chair at the University of Missouri.

In the provision for worship in the university chapel there is a decline. As the number of buildings increases, as they are scattered over a larger and larger area of campus, and as the number of students increases, it becomes more difficult to get a considerable number together for daily chapel. The faculty and student body in a large state university is complex in religious affiliation, and this condition makes it difficult—in some instances practically impossible—to provide a service of worship acceptable to all. The fact that so many institutions maintain the chapel exercise is evidence of the deep interest of some members of the faculty.

Table I gives report as to the chapel, but it must be read with the understanding that the term "chapel" does not mean the same in all places. One report states, "Ten or more years ago we had voluntary chapel service daily, but it died of inanition. Semiweekly services were substituted. At first these were religious, but this has not been so for six or seven years. There is no singing of hymns, no prayer is offered, the Bible is not read." Another states, "For-

merly chapel assembly for thirty minutes every day, now once a week. Usually some strong speaker, many of them ministers. Most of the addresses have a strong religious tone." At best the chapel service is brief and more or less formal and is not a substitute for the church service. The succession of leaders and speakers cannot grip the life and conscience of students as can a pastor who deals with their life problems week after week and who comes to know them intimately.

The Faculty

The number of the faculty who are members of and active workers in the local churches is an important factor in the problem. It is an accepted principle of university administration that ecclesiastical and political questions are not to be considered in making appointments, and it is clearly improper for any church to exert influence, directly or indirectly, for an appointment to the faculty from its membership. The genius of these American institutions requires that they be kept free from all sectarian influence. In making this survey no attempt was made to inquire into the personal life of the faculty members. Pastors of local churches were asked to report the number of the university staff who were, (*a*) members of the church or congregation—that is, those who were known to be interested in any way in the support of the church; (*b*) officials of the church, and (*c*) those who were teachers of Bible or other religious classes.

The fear of sectarian prejudice is wholesome when it leads a man to a position where he becomes a great Christian rather than a small sectarian, and the free atmosphere of the state university is favorable to the development of this much-needed type of religious leader. But it is important that the leaders do not march too far in advance of the army. Those who are interested in the advance of religion will naturally ally themselves with the organized forces, and as the case now stands these forces are the churches.

Table II gives the returns from the three questions. Only a minority take active part in the church life as officers and teachers. In 47 universities with 7,545 in the faculties, 726 are officers of the church and 502 are teachers in these churches. Of those reported as members no distinction is made between communicants and those who are only members of the congregation. There are inaccuracies in this part of the report due in part to the failure of the churches in securing information and in part to the reticence of the faculties. Of the others little is known. Their number is 3,472 out of a total of 7.454. Many of these may be deeply interested in religion; some of them feel that they are in advance of the churches and that the churches are to be ignored in planning for the advance movements; some are indifferent to the entire subject; some are hostile. Whatever uncertainty there may be as to the meaning of this part of the survey, it is clearly evident that the churches have not kept pace with the growth of the universities and have, by their own neglect, lost much of their rightful leadership in education.

Under normal conditions men and women employed to teach in colleges and universities ought to take an active

interest in the organized religious life of the community in which they live. In a state institution, where so many things conspire to exclude religion, it is more important that the instructor unite with some church where he will be free to exert a positive influence. Many of these instructors are specialists in narrow fields of learning and lack the training that would fit them to deal with the religious life of their students in any broad way, but this is an added reason why they should ally themselves with a church where they will secure the training which will lift them out of the narrowness of their restricted field and fit them for real leadership among their students.

That so many in these faculties are detached and remote from the community churches indicates an abnormal condition for which the several churches are largely responsible. In view of the fact that these institutions are rapidly growing in size and influence and that the evidence at hand seems to indicate that the estrangement between the churches and the campus increases with the growth of the university, it is clear that definite steps must be taken to bring about a normal relation between the faculties and the churches if the universities are properly to serve the states which support them.

The Students

Table III gives the figures obtained by the last religious census taken of the students in the institutions named. The accuracy of these figures varies. Where the university has taken this census for several years, the students have become accustomed to giving the information as a part of the social statistics required by the university. In such instances the figures are fairly accurate. In many instances the census is taken by volunteers and is not complete. In a few universities the undue fear of sectarian bias still prevents the taking of this census. This fear of religious questions is a weakness on the part of the universities. It has come down from a time when the sects were at war with each other and when scholarly men who desired peace withdrew from the contention. Some universities have not discovered that the war is over, and it is the duty of the churches to proclaim the fact by uniting on a constructive program which will leave no place for contention.

Table III clearly indicates that the student body in a large university is too complex to be dealt with by any one organization or church; that the solution of this difficult problem must come through a new type of unselfish, active, daily co-operation of all the churches in interest in a given university. The churches responsible for this program are those having a considerable number of students in that university.

It was not possible to discover in all cases how many of those giving a church preference were communicants. This distinction was made in some cases. Of a total of 13,270 giving church preference there were 8,867—or 66 per cent—communicants.

The column marked "No Information" includes students in summer and other short courses, but also includes a large number in regular courses who either refuse or neglect to make the return. Where it has been possible to

reach students personally in this class, many are found who come from church homes and many who are communicants in their home churches, but who for various reasons desire to be free from the church during their stay in the university.

This table shows what churches have enough students in each university to call for the employment of a pastor or pastors and indicates the churches that can easily co-operate in a union enterprise. The number of churches in interest in each institution is so small and so clearly defined that there is no danger either of unworthy competition or of forming an unwieldy organization of churches in co-operation.

2. Student Christian Associations

The Student Christian Associations were the first to enter the field. In doing this they earned the praise of the churches. The fact that they have been unable to solve the problem without the direct approach of the churches to their own students is due to conditions over which they have no control, and does not subject them to criticism. The history of the movement is, in brief, somewhat as follows:

The several churches in America have from the beginning met their responsibility for Christian education by founding and maintaining colleges. Of the 569 colleges and universities reported by the United States Commissioner of Education, 359 are under church control, and of the 145 reported as non-sectarian the majority are definitely affiliated with some one denomination.

In these colleges the Student Associations were organized after the pattern of the young people's societies in the churches, on the plan of student initiative and student leadership of classes and other activities, and are adapted to meet the needs of students where there is adult guidance for the Bible and other classes and activities. The president and faculty members are in the position of pastors to the student leaders. In the church college the student body is homogeneous, as compared with that in the large state university, and the total number of students is much smaller. Of the 359 colleges only 13 report one thousand or more students and only two report two thousand or more.

Conditions in the large state university are entirely different. Here is a community of from one to six or seven thousand people, with greatly varied interests, and the number is steadily increasing. The complexity is not merely a matter of religious affiliation, but grows out of many conditions. There are distinct sorority, fraternity, and other social groups, and social distinctions caused by the various schools and departments of instruction. For many purposes the students fall into groups of varying size. For religious education and for all the activities finding expression in worship and in service they must be dealt with in groups. As to how many should comprise the ideal group there may be no agreement, but when the purpose is understood to be the thorough training of each individual, there can be no question but that the number lies somewhere between two hundred and five hundred.

It is one thing to build up an institution that shall have in its membership the picked men from the entire body of students; it is a different and far more important enterprise to provide for the religious needs of the entire student body. The Associations in the large state universities are attempting the former, and have increased the emphasis on the institution by bringing in the large Association building, patterned after the buildings which have been so eminently successful in the cities where they are needed. In a university where there is provided for all students the gymnasium, library, reading-rooms, and social centers, and where there are no transients needing the dormitory rooms and restaurant, it seems unwise to call upon the churches to support these features. In at least some of the universities the energy and money required to maintain and develop the Association as an institution have interfered with its original purpose and it has become a competitor rather than a helper of the churches.

Where the student-led Bible classes are scattered through a large student body without competent adult guidance they tend to become superficial, and where this is the only religious instruction the student receives and it stands in contrast with the expert instruction given him in other subjects it often fails to hold his respect.

It needs to be repeated that these Associations deserve praise for attempting the solution of a problem which the churches entirely neglected, but it is now time for the churches to come together with a plan for meeting actual conditions. A central clearing-house is needed for all the churches in interest in each university. The Student Associations, by reason of their history and organization, should be best fitted to perform this function, but to do this will require a reorganization on a democratic basis by which the accredited representatives of the churches will come into its management. The university pastor should be placed in the same relation to the work of the association in the state university as the president maintains in the church college.

3. The Church

The churches that enter this field must understand at the outset that any emphasis upon sectarianism, any attempt to use this enterprise to build up the church as an end in itself, will be a source of almost fatal weakness. The emphasis in religious education must be here, as it ought to be everywhere, placed upon the individual and not upon the institution. Whenever we become more interested in building up a church, an association, or a college than in serving the community, we have gone a long way on the wrong road.

On the other hand, the demand that all unite in one church at the university and that all denominational lines be obliterated—in short, that there be accomplished at the university within the short period of the student's residence what all Christendom has failed to accomplish in centuries—cannot be said to meet the needs. Students are like other people, and this demand cannot be met. Those who ask for a single big church which is to meet the needs of the entire institution have had little actual experience either with churches or with

students. If this plan ever gets a fair trial it will result in building another church which will meet the needs of a limited number.

This demand, however, grows out of a feeling that the state university offers a unique opportunity for emphasizing the great fundamental truths of religion and for developing a strong leadership. The liberal intellectual atmosphere of the university discourages the growth of narrow sectarianism, and there is so much vague generalization regarding religion that very many look upon loyalty to a church as evidence of narrowness. This sort of teaching sends men into the world unattached; it is a breadth of view that is narrowing in its results. It too often leaves the graduates with only a general interest in religion as a subject for discussion, but without either motive or plan for Christian service. A report from one institution where students are encouraged to take this broad view and to go about among the churches without attaching themselves to any one, states: "Some of the churches that have tried this are disappointed. The students float around and do not connect with any church; rather, they sample them all. The fact is that many like to go around and see and hear what the churches have to offer. Many study on Sunday and go nowhere; some do not study on Sunday and still go nowhere."

The problem will not be solved until the local churches are developed as effective agencies for religious education and the students brought into these churches. This is a large task, larger than any church can accomplish without help, but with help it can be done. The universities are showing us the way. They are beginning to deal directly with every interest in the state except religion. Through their research laboratories, extension departments, experiment stations, the short courses for farmers, housekeepers, and others, they are bringing the results of modern scholarship directly into the homes, the factories, the farms, and all the industries of the state. They are vitalizing the state with the spirit, the method, and the results of scholarship. It is the duty of the church to vitalize scholarship with the spirit of Christ. The university sends its experts out to all parts of the state to meet the people directly, and then it brings the people, old and young, into the university. This is a new movement and has not yet reached all the universities, but it is sure to spread to all. The churches must follow the same plan, send their experts into the university and bring the members of the university into the churches.

The universities more than welcome the churches; they recognize the need and their own limitations. President Van Hise, who has carefully studied the problem and has had unusual opportunity for watching the methods and results of the work by the churches, says that this work must be done by the churches if it is to be done, and that it is better done than if the university were free to employ chaplains and direct the work itself. Religion is the business of the church, as it can never be of the state.

New as the enterprise of the churches is, enough has been accomplished to prove conclusively that the work is a success and that what is needed now is

a wise development of the plans already in use. This plan requires careful preparation on the part of the churches.

First, the local church at the university center through which the church at large must operate needs to maintain a religious life of high order. The message of its pulpit and the teaching of its classes must be clear, definite, and sincere. This is true, not because the student requires preaching and teaching of any peculiar type—on the contrary he is like other men and is quick to resent being preached at as though he were in a class by himself—but because as a transient in the community, busy with many things, he will not bother to listen to the message of the church unless it comes to him with the attractiveness of power that reaches his conscience and life. He has none of the pride in the church as an institution that often keeps the citizen member loyal to the church when it has ceased to minister either to his life or to that of the community. The pulpit must not compete with the classroom. The preacher must lead the intellectual life and know what faculty and students are reading and thinking, but he must know his science and philosophy so well that he can afford to forget them when he is preaching.

Second, the church must make readjustments that will cost its members the sacrifice of personal convenience and of money, if it is to take into its life and work a large number of students each year. Some churches have been unwilling to make this sacrifice; others have been slowly persuaded to make it under the strong leadership of the pastor and a few members, but enough have accomplished the change to demonstrate that there is no mission at home or abroad of more importance in the bringing in of the Kingdom of God than the one given to the church that is unselfishly and vigorously ministering each year to a great company of students who are soon to scatter to the ends of the earth and to carry the inspiration of its spirit and message into enlightened social service. A very few of these students enter the ministry or go into foreign mission work. They are the lawyers, the physicians, the engineers, the business men, the leaders in every vocation.

Third, there must be a staff of experts employed in addition to the preachers in charge of the churches. Our Protestant polity makes no provision for the ecclesiastical position of these men, and no title has been discovered which properly describes their work. At present we call them University Pastors, but they are independent of the university, being employed by the churches to work in the university, and their work is much more than is implied in the word "pastors." They are the accredited ambassadors of the church at the court of the state. They are trained and experienced experts in Christian education dealing with the most difficult and delicate problems of life at the one period when this dealing can be most effective. The child learns by imitation; when he is old enough to enter college he is ready and able to lay aside his former habits of thought and life and to take on new ones that appeal to his reason. He is now an idealist, looking for fundamental principles by which to guide his life. No department of learning requires such skill and wisdom

as is required to deal with the religious problems of the college student, for religion here means the entire inner life of the man as he is making his own adjustment to his own personal problems, to society, and to God.

Fourth, representatives of the several churches must co-operate and supplement each other's work, because only by this sort of unselfish helpfulness to each other can they convince the students that they are not propagandists working to build up some church or institution, and because the material of a religious education is so varied and rich that one man can handle only a part of it. In the selection of men there should be consultation with the men already employed, so that each one will be selected with the view of his supplying a missing part in the round of subjects already provided for. Appointments made in this way will result in an unofficial but very effective faculty of religious instruction.

The number of students uniting with the churches during their stay in the university and the number of candidates for the ministry and the missionary life is not a fair test of the success of this work, as it is not the custom for students to unite with the church while in college and students looking to the ministry usually go to the church college. In addition to this the majority of state-university students are in technical courses fitting for callings other than the ministry. Moreover, the direct approach of the church to its own students is so new that in many quarters it is scarcely understood. To those who understand these things it is significant that in 41 state institutions last year, 3,335 students united with the local churches, and there are 458 candidates for the Christian ministry and missionary life.

The following statement of general principles was adopted by the Council of Church Boards of Education held in Washington, D.C., January 13 to 15, 1914.

I. This Council of Church Boards of Education, by virtue of its constitution, should be advisory to and should strive to unite the various Christian movements on behalf of students, including the Church Student Pastor Movements, the Student Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., the Chapel Activities of university corporations, and the Church Societies.

II. National Church Boards should be encouraged to place in the field special Supervisory Secretaries, who would have direct supervision over their own representatives in local organizations and would investigate the work which is being done for their own students in institutions where they do not have special representatives. These Boards should also send their national recruiting officers for the ministry at home and abroad, social service, and evangelism into the local institutions to work with the students through the local clearing-house associations.

III. Local churches in university communities should be equipped for student work and should accept as affiliated members all students of their own communion who attend the university and provide for their proper pastoral care while they are in the university.

This Council, while recognizing the need of pursuing different policies based upon local conditions at each university center, affirms its unalterable conviction that pastoral care of students, leading up to contact with the local church, is absolutely necessary to the success of the movement

and the spiritual welfare of the student body.

IV. The churches should be represented in a university by a clearing-house association constituted somewhat as follows:

1) The membership to consist of all evangelical church members of the institution.

2) The Board of Control to be churchmen officially representing and appointed by the different communions which enter the organization.

3) The employed staff to be church representatives appointed by the proper church authorities in consultation with the local board and supported by the denominations and the local board, together with such others as may be chosen and supported by the local board.

4) This internal organization should have men's and women's departments affiliated in some democratic way with the American Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., and the World's Student Christian Federation.

5) The local and national staff should be college men specially adapted to student work, with theological training and church experience if possible, and in most cases ordained clergymen.

TABLE I

STATE UNIVERSITIES: CHAPEL SERVICES

In some instances the chapel service includes Scripture reading and prayer; in others it is the occasion for university announcements and occasional addresses without Scripture reading or prayer.

Of the 50 institutions reporting, 15 have no regular chapel service.

Institutions	Services per week
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	6
University of Alabama	5
University of Colorado	5
Colorado State Agricultural College	3
Connecticut Agricultural College	5
Georgia School of Technology	6
University of Idaho	1
Purdue University	1
Iowa State College of Agriculture	5
Iowa State Teachers College	5
University of Kansas	2
State University of Kentucky	1
University of Maine	5
University of Minnesota	3
University of Mississippi	5
University of New Mexico	2
Cornell University	2
North Dakota Agricultural College	1
University of North Dakota	1
Ohio University	1
Ohio State University	1
Miami University	5
University of Oklahoma	1
University of Oregon	1
Pennsylvania State College	5
University of Pennsylvania	5
Clemson Agricultural College (South Carolina)	5
South Dakota State College of Agriculture	1
University of South Dakota	1
University of Texas	6
Agricultural College of Utah	5
University of Vermont	6
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	6
University of Virginia	1
University of Wyoming	1

The 15 institutions having no regular chapel service are:

University of California
Colorado School of Mines
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Iowa
Massachusetts Agricultural College
University of Michigan
Michigan Agricultural College
Michigan College of Mines
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
New Mexico College of Agriculture
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin

TABLE II

STATE UNIVERSITIES: RELATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO LOCAL CHURCHES

Institutions	Total in Faculty	Members of Church or Congregation	No Information	Church Officials	Bible-Class Teachers
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	49	42	7	18	10
University of Alabama	26	16	10	1	4
University of California	677	91	586	25	9
University of Colorado	112	50	62	10	7
Colorado State Agricultural College	70	36	34	14	14
Colorado School of Mines	23	7	16	3	4
Connecticut Agricultural College	31	26	5	5	2
Georgia School of Technology	63	57	6	13	20
University of Idaho	73	48	25	3	4
University of Illinois	543	429	114	83	39
Indiana University	250	95	155	11	11
Purdue University	231	217	14	18	9
Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	250	172	78	27	12
Iowa State Teachers College	90	77	13	24	23
State University of Iowa	163	145	18	36	21
University of Kansas	217	132	85	30	30
University of Maine	126	53	73	13	7
Massachusetts Agricultural College	56	5	51	2	2
University of Michigan	341	186	155	36	12
Michigan Agricultural College	130	68	62	8	2
Michigan College of Mines	25	15	10	6	.....
University of Minnesota	499	171	308	.....	.....
University of Mississippi	27	25	2	9	9
University of Missouri	297	120	177	20	8
University of Nebraska	228	151	77	25	19
University of New Mexico	17	12	5	1	2
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	51	39	12	10	10
Cornell University	580	223	357	13	17
North Dakota Agricultural College	65	53	12	7	4
University of North Dakota	90	70	20	.....	.....
Ohio University	40	28	12	9	8
Ohio State University	250	97	153	22	17
Miami University	56	54	2	13	13
University of Oklahoma	76	54	22	13	10
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	75	39	36	10	7
University of Oregon	81	36	45	10	6
Pennsylvania State College	223	130	93	29	.....
Clemson Agricultural College (South Carolina)	84	80	4	13	14
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	60	41	19	11	8
University of South Dakota	46	36	10	10	7
Agricultural College of Utah	83	2	81	1	.....
University of Vermont	106	92	14	.....	.....
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	54	53	1	18	18
University of Virginia	52	30	22	8	9
University of Washington	180	129	51	6	13
University of Wisconsin	624	297	327	69	31
University of Wyoming	55	44	11	13	12
Totals	7,545	4,073	3,472	726	502

No distinction is made between those who are communicants and those who are more or less regular attendants.

TABLE III

STATE UNIVERSITIES: STUDENTS' RELIGIOUS CENSUS, JANUARY, 1914

Institutions	Baptist	Congregational	Christian	Episcopalian	Friends	German Reformed	Hebrew	Lutheran	Methodist	Presbyterian	Roman Catholic	Unitarian	United Brethren	United Presbyterian	Others	No Preference	No Information	Total
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	210	.....	18	72	....	....	7	4	329	106	20	....	....	....	4	18	147	935
University of Alabama	300	8	12	61	....	....	33	....	282	255	30	7	....	....	25	83	.....	1,096
University of California	128	301	129	494	10	....	60	....	401	707	280	125	....	....	182	1,837	2,031	6,885
University of Colorado	105	150	65	110	4	....	....	10	200	250	75	....	....	....	6	210	614	1,799
Colorado State Agricultural College	58	19	30	39	2	....	1	10	187	135	31	7	5	7	21	194	.....	746
Colorado School of Mines	7	11	2	34	....	....	1	2	21	25	16	1	....	1	....	79	67	267
Connecticut Agricultural College	21	70	2	32	....	....	15	8	20	3	23	2	....	....	17	6	34	274
Georgia School of Technology	123	.....	9	87	....	....	18	8	199	110	17	....	....	....	....	.....	231	794
University of Idaho	18	29	26	35	1	....	....	15	80	66	19	3	....	....	13	.....	503	808
University of Illinois	202	208	205	146	....	....	....	139	771	604	165	56	....	....	634	584	1,776	5,490
Indiana University	168	16	437	51	53	15	5	59	742	304	87	7	54	30	66	338	782	3,214
Purdue University	128	38	251	69	36	16	19	73	643	288	108	11	36	....	75	64	.....	1,849
Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	150	275	125	75	10	....	....	35	700	400	50	....	25	....	....	200	545	2,590
Iowa State Teachers College	156	226	129	38	13	23	2	26	942	311	278	4	34	41	291	.....	69	2,583
State University of Iowa	111	240	108	81	....	....	....	134	687	368	284	35	....	....	317	73	486	2,904
University of Kansas	122	247	188	85	16	....	....	42	609	387	84	....	....	16	115	237	892	3,040
State University of Kentucky	184	6	248	39	....	1	11	8	176	126	46	2	1	....	5	250	315	1,348
University of Maine	181	308	9	52	7	4	6	1	186	6	104	28	....	....	115	108	75	1,082
University of Michigan	550	650	75	540	....	....	....	....	1,010	900	....	....	....	....	....	.....	3,849	7,574
Michigan Agricultural College	232	281	11	139	9	21	18	51	489	192	128	22	6	7	....	.....	108	1,712
University of Minnesota	163	354	....	246	....	....	....	416	457	396	382	....	....	....	255	449	2,251	5,369
University of Mississippi	100	.....	5	10	....	....	6	....	100	79	....	....	....	....	....	.....	554	854
University of Missouri	471	50	629	118	2	....	30	29	668	464	96	16	....	....	76	404	381	3,433
University of Nebraska	173	332	210	155	9	....	8	195	875	590	210	36	42	28	45	110	1,069	4,087
University of New Mexico	7	7	6	12	....	....	2	....	22	18	9	....	....	....	1	18	65	167
New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	16	1	1	91	1	....	3	1	48	52	65	....	1	....	2	50	40	372
Cornell University	359	361	31	657	20	....	160	103	670	871	397	54	....	....	104	888	2,073	6,748
North Dakota Agricultural College	19	78	6	41	....	....	....	161	147	133	93	....	....	....	36	412	143	1,269
University of North Dakota	27	52	1	25	....	....	8	115	105	109	76	1	....	....	135	12	456	1,122
Ohio University	6	.....	28	3	....	....	....	8	130	65	15	....	3	4	2	125	549	935

Ohio State University	164	206	112	155	19	....	62	238	1,187	655	219	14	90	36	110	215	1,187	4,669
Miami University	13	6	37	18	1	18	3	29	198	124	28	1	25	17	21	22	317	878
University of Oklahoma	93	2	70	13	....	....	4	....	215	123	10	2	....	....	8	87	466	1,095
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College	150	.....	276	13	....	....	....	15	250	....	50	....	25	....	175	75	972	2,001
University of Oregon	11	19	24	9	2	....	3	3	59	55	7	3	2	....	....	84	613	900
Pennsylvania State College	93	11	20	116	29	143	49	242	385	482	104	7	27	29	51	169	86	2,043
University of Pennsylvania	180	78	30	431	27	80	310	189	377	447	390	13	7	....	58	.....	2,566	5,183
Clemson Agricultural College (South Carolina)	269	.....	1	67	....	....	4	22	230	140	6	....	....	....	10	14	48	811
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts	12	39	2	7	....	....	....	12	.....	....	20	....	....	15	....	.....	596	703
University of South Dakota	35	33	....	19	....	....	....	45	63	24	26	3	....	....	....	142	138	526
University of Texas	618	20	303	234	....	....	49	71	939	499	118	4	1	....	24	186	222	3,288
University of Vermont	51	190	....	68	....	....	9	3	118	22	82	16	....	3	8	36	195	801
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	88	1	17	93	....	3	5	13	149	112	20	1	2	....	4	7	.....	515
University of Virginia	122	7	30	273	....	2	15	4	177	151	29	3	7	....	7	13	60	900
University of Washington	127	274	74	243	6	....	22	72	306	405	129	39	....	....	90	653	530	2,970
University of Wisconsin	370	1,113	51	400	3	10	70	775	1,070	970	530	130	....	....	59	.....	419	5,970
University of Wyoming	15	12	....	40	....	....	....	8	40	40	17	1	....	....	....	.....	30	324

The accuracy of these figures varies in different institutions. Church preference includes communicants and those who name the church as a preference.
The column marked "No Information" includes students in summer and other short courses as well as regular students who decline to give the information.

REGENERATION IN PLANTS

JOHN M. COULTER, PH.D.
Professor of Botany, University of Chicago

Theology, in the nature of the case, must use analogies to express the relation between man and God. In the past religious analogies have been those of politics, of paternity, or of law. The rise of the biological sciences has affected all types of thinking and has given a new group of analogies as well as technical terms to other sciences than this. It is in the hope of assisting theology to appropriate this dominant type of thinking that the BIBLICAL WORLD *will occasionally print articles dealing with biological matters. The present article by a distinguished botanist contains a description of the life process, which abounds in suggestive parallels to that of spiritual life. Indeed, one cannot help inquiring whether they may not be something more than analogies.*

This title does not contain the implication that regeneration does not occur among animals, but simply that the facts in reference to it with which I am most familiar have been obtained from experimental work with plants. Attention was called to the phenomenon of regeneration probably first in connection with animals, when in 1744 Trembley sectioned hydras in various ways, and found that each piece was able to produce the lost parts. Later, similar experiments were performed with worms, as the earth worms. It was found that if such a worm be cut in two, the tail end produces a head, and the head end a tail. As the experimental study of regeneration was extended to include other animals and plants, the application of the term became extended, and somewhat indefinite. It is necessary, therefore, to define regeneration.

Strictly, regeneration means the restoration of a part that has been removed. For example, if a starfish loses an arm, a new arm is developed. If a root tip is cut off not far from the apex, a new tip is developed. The cells of the cut surface grow and restore the lost part. If the apex of the growing frond of certain ferns is split, each half re-forms the removed half. In these cases regeneration is strictly the restoration of a lost part.

On the other hand, if a root tip be cut farther back than in the case mentioned above, the cells of the cut surface do not form a new tip, but the cells behind organize a new growing point, and a new root replaces the old one that was mutilated. In many cases, if a stem is cut away from a root, the stump of the stem does not grow and replace the lost parts, but an entirely new stem arises from the root. Likewise most stems when removed from roots can be made to produce new roots. In all these cases there is not strictly a restoration of lost parts, but the development of a new structure that replaces the old one. In other words, it is replacement rather than restoration; but so far as the working body of the plant as a whole is concerned, it amounts to the same thing.

Another situation must be included. In trimming trees, for example, if the tip of the tree or of a branch is cut off, new branches arise, but none of them would have appeared if the old branch tips had not been removed. In this case, however, the new branches arise from what are called latent buds, growing points already organized, but prevented from developing by the growth of the old branches. The new branches replace the old ones, but they are not formed *de novo;* their primordia already exist and are simply stimulated to growth.

There are, therefore, at least three distinct categories included in what is called regeneration: (1) the literal restoration of a lost part, so that the old organ or structure is mended; (2) the organization of a new structure that replaces the old one; and (3) the stimulation into growth of an organ already started, but for some reason forbidden to develop. These categories make it evident that regeneration merges insensibly into ordinary vegetative growth, and that regeneration is not really different from ordinary growth.

This leads necessarily to an explanation of what growth means. The body of a plant consists of an innumerable number of units, called cells. The term cell is misleading, for the real unit is an organized bit of the living substance (protoplasm) called the protoplast, which in plants usually incases itself with a wall. Protoplasm is the material, and the protoplast is a definite organization of this material; in other words, it might be regarded as protoplasm individualized. The living plant body, therefore, is a congeries of protoplasts, not isolated within their cell walls, but communicating with one another by protoplasmic strands. All the protoplasts, therefore, are in living connection. This fact is necessary to know if one is to understand how one part of a plant can affect another part.

Among the many powers that belong to protoplasts, the one that relates to this discussion is the power of self-division. A protoplast divides in such a way that each of the two new protoplasts contains an equal share of every structure that belonged to the parent protoplast. The mechanism by which this equal division is accomplished is one of the most elaborate and interesting mechanisms known in plants and animals. The new protoplasts enlarge until they equal in size the parent protoplast, and thus two new cells replace one old cell. This means growth, but it is also the fundamental process of reproduction and inheritance. It is a function of a protoplast, therefore, to divide and to produce new cells, and in so doing to pass on to the new cells its own structure. In a plant body, however, many cells become what are called permanent cells, forming permanent tissue, which means that they do not divide to form new cells. It does not follow that such cells have lost the power of division, for almost any permanent cells can be stimulated to division, and thus become dividing cells again.

It is easy to follow the successive generations of dividing cells as they build up an organ or a structure of the body, but the baffling problem as yet is the far-reaching, directing influence that determines the particular kind of organ or structure which these dividing cells

build. The important things to remember, however, so far as regeneration is concerned, are that any protoplast can produce new cells; that it can be stimulated into division even if it has ceased dividing; and that the generations of cells it produces may form a complete organ or structure.

It is as difficult to distinguish regeneration from reproduction as to distinguish it from growth. It is very common for a group of vegetative cells to produce a new individual. In fact, much of our plant culture depends upon this. A potato tuber and a hyacinth bulb are merely aggregates of vegetative cells, but under certain conditions they produce new individuals, which is what is technically called reproduction. Spores and eggs, which are single cells, show the same power. The difference between reproduction and regeneration, therefore, is simply that in regeneration certain lost parts are restored or replaced, while in reproduction all the parts are gone, and therefore all the parts are reproduced.

It is obvious, therefore, that cell division is the fundamental process which results in growth, in regeneration, or in reproduction; it produces a new individual, or it repairs an old individual, or it merely causes an individual to grow. This statement fits regeneration into its setting as simply one expression of a general power which belongs to all protoplasts.

When the phenomena of regeneration began to accumulate, some explanation was sought. If regeneration had been associated at first with growth and reproduction, as simply one expression of a general power possessed by all protoplasts, many of the "explanations" would never have been advanced. For example, it was suggested that regeneration is caused by the wound stimulus; that is, the very act that removes a structure arouses the remaining cells to an activity that restores it. Another suggestion was that the loss of a part necessarily disturbs the nutritive relations of a plant, and this results in a growth stimulus. It was also proposed that changes in the water content of a plant, resulting from a loss of a part, might also result in the unusual growth represented by regeneration. These are but samples of the many "explanations" advanced; some of them resting upon a considerable body of evidence, and some of them purely speculative.

When the problem was taken up seriously and completely, and all the proposed explanations tested, one by one, the case seemed to become clear. The wound stimulus, the disturbed nutritive relations, the change in water content, and the whole brood of "explanations" were proved to be entirely inadequate. Investigators began to realize the relationship of regeneration to growth and reproduction, and, therefore, that the explanation of it must be due chiefly to inherent powers in the plant itself.

It will be remembered that when a part is removed, as in the pruning of trees, dormant primordia are stimulated to develop which otherwise would remain dormant. At the same time, the removal of a part, as a stem or a root, starts the development of primordia when they do not exist. Still further, it was found by experiment that one does not have to remove one structure so

that another may be allowed to develop, but he can accomplish the same thing by preventing a structure from functioning, which is equivalent to its removal so far as regeneration is concerned. This, of course, would dispose necessarily of the wound stimulus idea. The real picture of a plant body, therefore, is that it is made up of innumerable growing points, either organized or potential, and that these growing points are held in check by the parts already growing. The failure of many growing points of a plant to develop has been found to be due, not to lack of conditions that favor growth, as nutrition and moisture, or to such external stimuli as light and gravity, or to any lack of suitable food material, but to some influence independent of all these, which one organ is able to exert over other parts, and so prevent their growth. If such an organ is removed, then growth of the inhibited structures occurs. The very act of growth of one part, therefore, forbids the growth of numerous structures which could replace it. What this inhibiting influence is that one organ exerts over other parts of the body, one can hardly imagine, but it is entirely probable that it acts along the protoplasmic connections which put all the protoplasts into one living system. A potential growing point is nothing but a group of protoplasts anywhere in the body, and these protoplasts are not so much stimulated into growth, as permitted to grow by the removal of some structure that has prevented their development.

A somewhat more detailed account of regeneration as shown in *Zamia* may make the facts more definite. *Zamia* is a small cycad that grows abundantly in Florida. The body resembles a woody turnip or radish, bearing a crown of leaves above, and sending out roots below. It was noticed in the field that when the top of the stem was sliced off with a hoe, a new crown would develop. The plant, therefore, seemed to be a favorable one for some experimental work on regeneration. The crude field observations were verified, and in every case a decapitated body, if kept in growing conditions, developed a new top with its crown of leaves. This was a case of strict regeneration; that is, the restoration of a lost part, the new structure becoming an integral part of the old. There was no stimulating into development a new structure sprouting out of the old to replace it, but the mutilated body was made whole again. Moreover, the lost part was not a subordinate one, but the most prominent and important part of the plant.

The process of regeneration was observed in detail, and was as follows. Through the center of the body there extends a hollow woody cylinder, called the vascular cylinder because it is a conducting system, transporting water and the various elaborated foods. At the top of the stem this cylinder domes over, so that it underlies completely the crown of leaves to which it delivers water. Nothing is of more fundamental importance in the plant than this vascular system, for without it the plant would be like an animal without a circulatory system. When *Zamia* is decapitated, therefore, the top of this vascular system is cut off, and the cylinder becomes an open, mutilated tube. Vascular tissue is the most per-

manent tissue in the plant body, and therefore least capable of cell division, but when regeneration begins in *Zamia* this mutilated vascular system is mended first, new vascular tissue being formed which connects with the remaining tissue and domes over the cylinder again. After the cylinder is completely restored, the new crown of leaves begins to appear, and soon the plant is complete again.

This illustration shows that regeneration is not necessarily a superficial process, resulting in an excrescent growth over a deformed interior, but it is first an internal reconstruction, followed by the normal development of external organs.

Some recent developments in connection with grafting are of interest in this connection. When one kind of plant is grafted upon another, the process by which the mutilated tissues become knit together into a continuous living body is a process of regeneration. The plant into which the graft is inserted is called the *stock*, and the inserted graft is called the *scion*. It has always been a question as to the mutual influence of stock and scion. They are different kinds of plants, with different leaves, flowers, and fruits, but in general each produces its own characteristic structures, although they have become parts of one body.

In comparatively recent times, however, attention has been called to what are termed "graft hybrids," which means that the scion takes on some of the characters of the stock, and thus becomes a hybrid. The most interesting fact in reference to these hybrids is that the tissues of the two parent plants remain distinct. Sometimes the graft hybrid is a mosaic of the two parent plants, the tissues from the two distinct origins being related to one another in patches. But most interesting are those graft hybrids in which the tissues from one parent invest those from the other parent as a mantle. Externally, therefore, such a hybrid resembles one of the parents exactly, but internally its whole structure is that of the other parent, and each region produces the structures peculiar to itself. Such composite plants are called "chimaeras," and they deserve the name. It is certainly a wonderful structure that combines in one organic whole tissues received from two sources, and which remain distinct. To graft one plant into another, therefore, may mean the production of a new kind of individual, one that is not an ordinary hybrid, inheriting qualities from one parent or the other, but combining the structures of both, one being the mantle of the other, and each doing its own work.

In conclusion, it may be said that the power of regeneration is as extensive as are living cells, and its results are as various as are the structures of the body. Not only can it restore lost parts to a mutilated structure, make a new structure to replace one that is lost, and call into activity dormant structures that have been held in check by the vigor of other parts, but it can also take two individuals and make a composite organism in which neither individuality is lost, but both live together as one body.

MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL

V. THE DEITY OF CHRIST IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN THOUGHT

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.
Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary
Author of "Christian Theology in Outline"

Anyone who thinks there is no interest in the question of the Person of Jesus is certainly unacquainted with the temper of Christianity. The desire of the intelligent Christian is not to believe less, but more intensely, in Jesus. The difficulty which he finds is not with him, but with the interpretations which may have been put upon him. He wishes to make Jesus real to himself in terms of Jesus' highest value.

That is the state of mind in which tens of thousands of thoughtful men and women find themselves. In the May number of the BIBLICAL WORLD *we printed an article by Professor Miller, of Princeton University, discussing the New Testament conception of Jesus' divinity, but this article by Professor Brown faces the same issue from the point of view of a theologian rather than that of a student of the New Testament. Both of these articles will of course be read discriminatingly, but both alike cannot fail to make an impression of a vital trust in Jesus as the supreme revelation of God, which is superior to any formal assent to inherited creeds. In both cases we see how thoughtful men, by different methods, are seeking to re-express to their day those fundamental religious valuations of Jesus as Divine Savior which found expression in earlier centuries in philosophical terms then current.*

In the preceding articles we have considered the Christian answer to the three great questions of religion: the question as to the source of faith, or the seal of authority in religion; the question as to the object of faith, or the nature of God and our relation to him; and the question as to the effect of faith, or the kind of help that we can expect from God in the practical needs of our daily lives. We have asked ourselves what modern theology has to tell us about the Bible, about God, and about salvation. In this study Christ has been our constant companion. We have been looking at the great realities of religion as it were through his eyes. We have been trying to see them as he sees them and to think of them as he would have us think of them, and in doing this we have been studying Christ himself.

But we have been doing so by indirection, as one might study the sun by observing the effects which it produces upon the growing grain, or the light that shines to us out of the eyes of a friend. It is time to make our study more intensive and to ask ourselves who and what is this Christ who has been our com-

panion, and what place he is likely to hold in the religion of the future.

We know the place that he has held in the faith of the past. Christ has been the very center and heart of the Christian religion. No term that language can coin has been too exalted to express the reverence and devotion with which his disciples have regarded him. To them he has been not merely man—even the best and purest of men—but God himself incarnate for our salvation.

The doctrine which expresses this faith is the deity of Christ. This is the test by which men's Christianity has commonly been judged in the past. What do you think of Christ? Is he your master, your example, your ideal? That is well, but it is not enough. Can you say with Thomas, "My Lord and my God"? If not, you have no right to a place in the ranks of his disciples.

Is this an attitude which we can still hold today? Shall we take over into the new world the old faith in the deity of Christ, or is it something that we must leave behind?

At first sight, indeed, it might seem as if it were difficult to take it over. When we contemplate Christ as he is presented to us in the older theology there is something about him that seems remote and unfamiliar. He is in our world, yet not of it. Through our human life of sorrow and limitation and sin he moves as a figure from another planet. He wears the face of a man. He speaks to us from human lips. He eats and sleeps and wakes and labors as we do. He weeps when Lazarus dies; he cries out in the garden, "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." But we feel instinctively that these experiences are not like ours. Humanity is only a mask which he wears, a garment that he has put on to cloak the immanent deity. But the divine Christ who hides behind the human Jesus, and to whom alone our worship is due, shares none of these experiences. He does not suffer or pray; he knows no limitations of knowledge or power. Through all the changes of the changing humanity he remains unchanged, "God over all, blessed forever." The Christ of the old theology is not a human individual like you and me. He is the God-man, one person with two natures, one divine and one human, each distinct and separate from the other.

The Jesus who is pictured for us by modern theology is a different figure. He is a human individual, child of his race and of his time, only to be understood in the light of his environment and of the antecedents, physical and spiritual, from which he came. It is not that modern theology makes any less of Christ. On the contrary, we saw that one of its effects has been to emphasize even more strongly than before his central place in Christianity. But it looks at him from a different angle; and this difference may be expressed by saying that whereas the older theology was content to affirm the humanity of Jesus in general terms, modern theology tries to realize in detail the human individuality of Jesus.

This change is not due simply to the fact that we know more about Jesus than earlier generations knew. That is true, but of itself it would not account for the difference. It is the result of a far-reaching change in our conception of reality. The older theologians

thought of reality in abstract terms. Human nature was more real to them than any particular man. When they wished to conceive of God as entering into humanity they thought of him as assuming human nature as a whole. To picture him as incarnate in a single individual passed their imagination. Even as it was, the contrast between Creator and creature was so great that it could never be wholly transcended. In the person of Christ, as elsewhere in the universe, the finite and the infinite might touch, but they could not blend. Between God and man there stretched a gulf which even incarnation could not span.

But the world in which we modern men live is the world of the individual and the concrete. We know human nature only as it meets us in particular men. If God is really to enter humanity we must be able to find him in lives like ours, lives that are limited and conditioned, inwardly as well as outwardly, and that appropriate the spiritual realities that transcend time, in forms that are determined by some particular environment. It is not because we would make less of Jesus that we magnify his likeness to ourselves. It is because we feel our need of him so much.

At the heart of the critical research of the last two generations, then, we find not simply an intellectual but a religious motive. Modern theology has been studying the setting of the life of Jesus in detail in order that it might restore his personality to our imagination.

Some years ago I stood on the summit of the hill that rises behind Nazareth. In front rose Mount Tabor, cutting the view into two unequal parts. Behind the hills to the northeast, nestling in its sheltered basin, lay the Sea of Galilee. On the more distant horizon rose the snowy peak of Hermon. To the south opened the fertile plain that stretches without interruption to Jenin, and behind it the hills amid which lies Samaria; and still farther, the tableland of Judaea, where David built his city on the heights which he had won with the sword. Back of me was Mount Carmel, with its memories of Elijah, and the Mediterranean, where Solomon had sailed his ships. At my feet lay Nazareth, amid its encircling hills, and Mary's well, where the boy Jesus must often have gone with his mother as she went to fetch the water for her household tasks.

In a well-known passage in his historical geography of Palestine, George Adam Smith has used this scene as a framework to make real to us the inner life of Jesus. One by one he pictures the sights that Jesus must have witnessed as he lived his boy's life from day to day—the caravans wending their slow way from the desert, as you can still see them doing today; the Roman legions on their way to take ship for home; the pilgrims going up to Jerusalem for the Passover. As you follow the description you forget the flight of time and it seems as if you were back again in the first century and mingling with the crowds who gathered about the new teacher whose words had so persuasive and winning a charm.

What George Adam Smith does for the boyhood of Jesus, modern theology tries to do for the life of Jesus as a whole. It puts it in its setting as part of a larger

environment. We know today as we have never known before the world in which Jesus lived. We can picture to ourselves the habits and customs of the time, the life of synagogue and temple, the books Jesus must have read, the men and women he must have known, the topics of thought with which he must have been familiar, the conflicting ideals between which he was obliged to choose.

Nor is it only the outward environment that we are able to reproduce, but the inner conditions under which Jesus' life was lived. We understand better than we once did what it means to be a man. Psychology has been studying the inner life and formulating its laws; the law of growth, for example, under which the mind, like the body, appropriates to its use that upon which it feeds; the law of limitation, by which we are shut up to choice between alternatives, paying for each new increase of knowledge by some new restriction of attention and deliberate forgetfulness. We know that personality is a social creation, that we think in forms inherited from our ancestors and defined for us by our time, and that we put the treasures of divine truth in the earthen vessel of a limiting environment.

All this reacts upon our view of Jesus. We see him subject to this law, sharing our limitations of knowledge and of power, growing day by day into larger insight, entering into the lives of others by sympathy, made partaker of our infirmities, learning obedience by the things which he suffered.

And as a result of this new realization there has come to us as never before a consciousness of Christ's brotherhood. I suppose there has never been a time in human history when so many men have realized as realize today that Jesus Christ is their brother, bone of their bone, and flesh of their flesh, very man, with all that that implies, and for this we may well thank God.

It would be strange indeed if this new emphasis on that which Christ shares with us should not lead some to question whether there is any difference between him and other men. Unitarianism is only the most conspicuous example of a tendency which is widespread—the tendency to think of Christ in terms of humanity pure and simple, and to regard the historic Christian faith in his deity as a superstition, beautiful if you will, helpful—even indispensable—in its day, which we have outgrown.

And yet there is something in each one of us that rebels at so negative a conclusion. When we realize how deeply this faith in the divine Christ has rooted itself in the Christian experience; when we recall how early it began and how long it has persisted; when we try to measure the devotion and the loyalty it has called forth in generations of Christian believers, from Paul and John in New Testament times down to critical German theologians like Schleiermacher and Ritschl, we feel that it must stand for some truth of vital practical importance which we can ill afford to let go.

Here modern theology comes to our aid and this in three ways: In the first place, it shows us what Christ's deity has meant to those who have held it in the past. In the second place, it reminds us that the motives which led them to this faith are still operative with us. In the third place, it makes clear the

kind of evidence by which the validity of this faith must be tested for the future.

And first of what the doctrine has meant in the past. I have spoken of the contrast between the older conception of Christ's deity and that which we hold today. But it is easy to exaggerate this contrast. The deity of Christ has never been simply an intellectual belief. It is more than a dogma received on authority. It is the confession of faith in a reality with which men have believed themselves to have contact at first hand. They have explained that reality in different ways, but their differences have been differences of interpretation and not of experience. Side by side with the changing opinions about Christ certain permanent convictions persist which express his practical effect upon human lives, and these practical convictions the doctrine of his deity sums up.

This distinction between the permanent reality, which is the object of our faith, and our own changing definition of it is familiar enough, and yet it is one which we are constantly tempted to overlook. We confuse our thoughts of things with the things themselves. And the more important the things are, the more they mean for our practical life, the easier it is to do this. We need constantly to be reminded that theology exists for the sake of religion; that our definitions are designed to make the objects of our faith more real, never to serve as a substitute for them.

The masters of theology have always understood this. They have been interested in theology because they were interested in religion; they were first of all Christians, then theologians, and they were able to think helpfully about religion because they had first experienced the realities of which they talked.

The difficulty began with their successors, who no longer shared this intense personal experience and who tried to live on the experience of the past. These men took over the old definitions and presented them to the new generation as if they were the realities they were meant to describe. They branded any departure from the old language as heresy, and so promoted that confusion of religion and theology which has done so much harm.

Take that old debate between the Arminians and the Calvinists that has continued through so many centuries without either being able to convince the other. What is the root of the trouble? It is the confusion of reality and theory. We have to do with two great facts, each rooted in experience, both essential to a vital piety—the freedom of man and the sovereignty of God. But the theologians have begun to speculate about these facts and have identified their speculations with the realities they were meant to explain. They have said, No one can believe in freedom who does not hold my theory of the will. No one can hold divine sovereignty who questions my doctrine of the decree. And the result has been division where there should have been union; suspicion where there should have been sympathy.

The difficulty is aggravated by the fact that we use definitions for different purposes. The interest of the scientist is not the same as that of the man of affairs. Science defines by a process of elimination. It tries to analyze the particular object it studies into its sim-

plest elements and to express these in a logical formula so condensed that it will not need to be revised. But the definitions of practical life need constant revision, for they are descriptions of realities that must be experienced in order to be understood, and experience is always changing.

How shall I define water? Let me ask the chemist and he will tell me that water is H_2O—and by that he means that whenever I put together two parts of hydrogen gas and one of oxygen I get water. And that is true. But suppose I am trying to describe water to a man who had never seen it, what good would such a definition be?

What is water? Water is something you drink when you are thirsty. It is something you wash with when you need cleansing. It is something that irrigates your fields and that feeds your flowers. It is something that will carry you from St. Paul to the Gulf, and from New York to Liverpool. It is Niagara Falls and the Yosemite. It is the stream that ripples under the alders. It is the deep pool where you caught your first trout.

We must make a similar distinction in our interpretation of Christ. How shall I define Jesus Christ? That depends upon your purpose in asking the question. Are you a theologian, with a specialist's technical interest, wishing to know the elements which enter into the making of our thought of Christ, and the proportions in which they are compounded? Then I will answer you in the terms of the Chalcedonian creed. Jesus Christ is very man and very God —two natures in one person, each complete and perfect. You cannot express what he means for your life in any less comprehensive terms. He is not partly man and partly God. He is not sometimes man and sometimes God. He is both God and man everywhere and always. He is God in man reconciling the world unto himself.

But suppose the man who asks the question is one whom I am trying to win to Christian discipleship. What good will it do to quote him the Chalcedonian creed? I do not give the thirsty man the chemist's formula, but a drink of water. So I do not bring the thirsty spirit a formula about Christ, but Christ.

But I must know what Christ can do for human needs if I am to present him intelligently. I do not offer the thirsty man a bath. So, in presenting Christ as God's answer to man's need, I study the particular need that requires help, and show how Christ meets it. And the intelligent and systematic description of the way in which the divine Christ answers human need all along the line is my theology.

What is Jesus Christ? He is the friend who has revealed to me as no one else has ever done my own better nature. He is the helper from whom I have drawn comfort in sorrow and inspiration for duty. He is the leader whom I have promised to follow to the death, and in whose service I have found perfect freedom. He is the window through which I have looked into the face of God. This, too, is a definition, and in its way as scientific as the other. Only it is a definition that will never be finished. For it is a definition to which each new generation is adding as it brings its own experience and lays it as a tribute at the feet of Christ.

Let us apply these principles more in detail to the particular aspect of Christ's many-sided personality with which we are here concerned. What does it mean to believe in the deity of Jesus Christ? For the theologian it means that whatever your idea of God may be, that idea in its completeness must enter into your explanation of Jesus Christ. But for the Christian believer it means that you have had certain personal experiences with Christ which irresistibly suggest to your mind the thought of God. It means that Christ has done for you what you are sure that only God can do.

But what does God do for us? What does it mean to believe in him, not as a doctrine of the mind, but as a reality personally experienced. It means three things. It means, in the first place, that we trust him for the supply of all our needs—the need of forgiveness, of guidance, of comfort, of inspiration. It means, in the second place, that we submit our wills to him without reserve as to an authority who has the right to command. It means, finally, that we look up to him in reverence as the being in whom all our ideals are realized, and all our aspirations fulfilled. Trust, loyalty, reverence—these are the three notes of religion everywhere and always, and these are the three characteristic marks of faith in God.

To believe in the deity of Jesus Christ, then, must mean that in some unmistakable way Christ fulfils these three functions in human life: that we are conscious of dependence on him for the supply of our deepest needs; that we own his right to command; that he is our supreme standard of excellence. And this is what we find to be the case as a matter of fact.

What does it mean to believe in the deity of Jesus Christ? It means in the first place to obey him. It means to make him master of one's own personal life; to judge questions of right and wrong by the standard he has revealed; to measure progress, whether of the individual or of society, according to the extent to which each approaches his ideals, and reproduces his character.

Again, to believe in the deity of Jesus Christ means to trust him. It means to put our life and destiny in his keeping, confident that both will be safe. It means to find in him assurance that our sins have been forgiven, and ground for hope that they will finally be overcome. It means to see in him the revelation in human form of that unseen power on whom we all depend, who is guiding the world in ways we cannot understand to the far-off end he has decreed. It means to be sure that however for the time he may seem to fail, yet in the end he will have his way, and the kingdoms of the world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ.

Above all, to believe in the deity of Jesus Christ means to worship him: not simply to obey him, but to yield him a willing obedience; not merely to trust him but to rejoice in our trust. It means to see in Jesus Christ the most wonderful and adorable thing in the whole world; to accept his law of love as the divine law; to look up into his face as he hangs on the cross and to have kindled within us a passion for sacrifice that will send us out in self-forgetful service to our brothers and sisters who are in need.

These great experiences of trust, of loyalty, and of reverence find concise expression in the doctrine of Christ's deity. It is the formulation for thought of a reality verifiable in experience—the experience, namely, of the transforming influence of Christ in human life. To say that I believe in the deity of Jesus Christ means, if the confession be genuine, that I find in him my Master, my Savior, and my Realized Ideal.

This practical attitude toward Christ is consistent with a great diversity of theological opinion. There are many questions about him which it leaves unanswered. How shall I conceive the relation between the human Jesus and the unseen God who is manifest in him? How shall I understand the presence in time of the eternal that transcends time? These are questions on which men's minds have been at work for centuries, and on which they are still far from agreement. It would be interesting, if there were time, to consider the different answers which have been given and to estimate their value. It would be instructive to point out why the theologians of the ancient church, trained in the Platonic philosophy, found it most natural to describe the relation between humanity and divinity in Christ in the abstract formula of a union of natures; whereas, we of the modern world, with our more vital metaphysics, express the same reality most readily in terms that are ethical and spiritual. But we are concerned here not with the speculations on which men differ, but with the experiences on which they agree. We wish to know the meaning of Christ's deity for personal religion, and this can be summed up in these three words: power, authority, character.

Thus far we have been concerned with interpretation. What I have just given is not a modern invention—a new theory of Christ's deity to be added to others which have gone before. It is the summary of certain personal experiences which have been called forth in man by contact with Jesus Christ. Whether we look at the first century, or the fifth, or the sixteenth, or our own, we find that as men have come to know Christ they have begun to trust him, and this trust has borne fruit in loyalty and in reverence; and these experiences of trust, of loyalty, and of reverence have voiced themselves in the historic faith in his deity.

The first contribution of modern theology, then, to our understanding of Christ's deity is a reminder of what this faith has meant to those who have held it in the past. But our interest is not primarily historical. Jesus Christ belongs not simply to the past, but to the present. He is a factor in our modern world, and we have to decide as to our own personal attitude toward him. Here, too, modern theology has a contribution to make. It shows us that the motives which led the first Christians to their faith in his deity are still operative with us.

When we inquire as to the motive which first led men to emphasize the deity of Jesus Christ we shall find that it was their sense of having found in him a satisfying revelation. And by this I mean a revelation that should be at once definite and permanent, able to meet the present need of guidance and assurance, and at the same time to hold its own

through the changes of the passing generations.

This need of a definite revelation recurs again and again in human experience. However exalted may have been men's thought of God, however much they may have emphasized the contrast between him and themselves, they have never been satisfied with a religion that left him permanently at a distance. They have wanted God to enter into their own personal experience and evidence his presence there in ways that were unmistakable. The history of religion is the story of man's search for God, and of the ways in which they have believed that God has answered their quest. Sometimes in strange natural phenomena—the earthquake, the lightning, the fire, the pestilence—sometimes through the word of prophet or lawgiver or seer, and again in the silence of his own spirit, man has heard God speaking to his own soul, and has been satisfied.

This need for a self-revealing God is not simply intellectual. It springs from man's consciousness of his own limitations and failures. It is not merely that he is curious to know what God is like. He wishes to know what is God's disposition toward him as a helper in the personal problems of which his life is full. He needs comfort in his sorrows, forgiveness for his sins, guidance in his perplexities, an answer to his unanswered questions. Above all, he needs enfranchisement, the personal renewal in which the bondage of habit is broken and the spirit made free for the larger life of service. And the greater his practical need, the more numerous and the more distressing the disabilities under which he labors, the more hopeless his situation, measured in terms of human strength and wisdom alone, the more acute his longing for some clear word from God on which he can rely. To appreciate Paul's answer to the Philippian jailer, you must first understand the question that prompted it: "What must I do to be saved?"

If we analyze the ways in which men have thought of God as answering this need for definite self-revelation, we find that they fall into two groups: they have thought of God as speaking to them from without, in signs and wonders that evidence his power; and they have thought of him as speaking to them within, through some redemptive experience that reveals his love. The contrast runs through the whole history of religion. It meets us in the New Testament, in the demand of the Pharisees for a sign, and in Jesus' refusal to give any sign but preaching, like that of Jonah at which the men of Nineveh repented. It persists down to our own day in the contrast between the apologetic, which rests its case upon miracle, and that which finds its convincing proof in the evidence of Christian experience. It goes back at last to the conception of God, whether we make power or character determinative for our thought of deity.

One need not undervalue God's power to feel that the second method of approach is more truly Christian. Almighty though he be, the Father whom Jesus revealed cannot be described in terms of power alone. He is wisdom and righteousness and love, and if he is to enter human life at all, he can do so completely only in terms of the perfect

character. The revelation that is adequately to express him must present him as the just judge, knowing the heart of man and understanding the motives by which it is swayed; as the loving father, sympathizing with his child in his sorrows and temptations, and believing in his ultimate home-coming in spite of waywardness and sin; as the good shepherd, giving his life for the sheep. Could we find a man who realized this ideal of character, a man so pure as to convict us of sin, so understanding as to reveal to us our own better nature, so self-sacrificing as to give his life that others might live, we should have the conditions under which, and under which alone, God could adequately reveal himself to man.

Such a man the disciples found in Jesus. In him they saw one who expressed in human form their highest ideal of God—a man so pure that when they touched him they were conscious as never before of their sin, yet at the same time so full of faith as to inspire in them the hope that they too might some day become like him. In Jesus they found the complete answer to all their needs—understanding, sympathy, forgiveness, inspiration, power. He was to them God's clear and final word to man.

We, too, share their need of some clear word from God. And for us, too, Jesus provides the answer to this need. Less introspective than our fathers, more concerned with the problems of social than of individual sin, we find in Jesus our leader in the struggle for social righteousness, the prophet of spiritual democracy, the preacher and founder of the kingdom of God. But for us, too, as for earlier generations, his personality retains its perennial freshness. For us, as for them, he is Savior as well as leader the one in whom we find the answer to our individual as well as our social need. If we are to define God in terms of a single character it is to Jesus that we must turn.

This appeal is independent of the fluctuations of critical opinion. However the critics may reconstruct the story that lies back of the Gospels, they cannot alter the picture the Gospels present. Here in the pages of the evangelists we meet a figure so individual and distinctive that after all the lapse of centuries he still speaks to us with a spiritual authority as direct and compelling as that which won him his first disciples by the lake shore. For us as for them he expresses in terms of a human life our highest thought of God.

But, we may be asked, why confine God's revelation to a single individual? Why should not God express himself through many men? Why may not humanity as a whole be his progressive self-manifestation?

It might be sufficient to say that humanity as a whole is not such as to suggest to most men the thought of God. Men as we know them today are sinful and unlovely, still under the dominion of the selfishness and passions from which Christ came to set them free. Even the best of men are imperfect, differing not only in their ideals, but in the extent to which they have realized them. It is just because we meet such diversity of belief and of character that our need for a definite and authoritative revelation is so great.

But such an answer does not quite

meet the point of the question. Those who ask it are not thinking of man as he is, but as he is to be when God shall have completed his redemptive work. And they wish to know how that consummation can most speedily be reached. Why should God deal with us indirectly by pointing us to a figure in the past? Why should he not impart himself directly to each individual? When all are his children, why separate one from the rest as "the Son"?

It is the spirit of democracy which voices itself in the question. One of the notes of our day is a new consciousness of the worth and of the possibilities of the individual. Men are no longer willing to take things on authority. It is not enough for them to know that it has been so in the past. They wish to test things for themselves, and live their own lives in the freedom of independent personalities. If they are to have a government, it must be one of their own choosing. If they are to have a God, it must be one whom they have tried for themselves and found satisfying.

And there is much that is splendid in this spirit. It is responsible for many reforms in church and state. It is our hope of progress in the future. Without independent personalities conscious of their own worth and willing to take the risks of liberty, you cannot have either a free state or a free church.

But, after all, this is only one side of democracy. The democratic spirit is a spirit of freedom, but it is a brotherly spirit as well. And brotherhood requires self-discipline. It means the willingness to learn as well as to teach, to serve as well as to rule. Democracy is not the dissolution of society into the individual units that compose it. That would be anarchy. Democracy is the extension to humanity as a whole of those ideals of beauty and goodness and truth which have hitherto been the prerogative of the select few.

There is a peril here against which we need to be on our guard. I have spoken more than once of the disintegrating tendencies that are abroad, the loss of efficiency which comes with the breaking down of standards. The tendency is natural, inevitable perhaps, but none the less dangerous. If we are to realize the ideal of brotherhood there must be some counteracting influence, some common test, to which we can all refer, some principle of integration strong enough to resist the divisive tendencies of individualism.

All the more, then, if we share the democratic ideal do we need Jesus. We need him to define for us the kind of life which we desire all men to share. We need him to reveal to us the kind of God with whom each one of us may have direct personal communion if we will. We need him to inspire us to common service and form a bond of union between men who but for him would be separated from one another.

It is a great mistake to think of the doctrine of Christ's deity as designed to separate him from other men. That has never been its purpose. It was designed to bring him near to men, to show us what are the kind of blessings which through him God plans to impart to us all. If men pictured Christ in abstract terms, one person with two natures, that was because they thought of God and man in abstract ways, not because they designed to keep them apart. To the

mind, indeed, incarnation might involve a contradiction, but to the heart it was the expression of the fundamental experience of all religion, God's presence with men in redemptive and triumphal love. "He became what we are," wrote Irenaeus, "that we might become what he is."

This is the meaning of that old truth of the Messiahship of Jesus which holds so large a place in the New Testament. It is the assertion of the continuity of the divine revelation. To call Jesus Messiah is to assign to him a place in the larger drama of history. He is not an isolated figure who comes to us out of the clouds, without relation to the past or the future. He is the center of a progressive revelation which began with the dawn of human history and will not be complete till all mankind own his sway and conform to his ideals. He is the expression in individual form and under particular historic conditions of what God purposes for humanity everywhere and always.

We, too, share the need of an interpretation of history. Looked at from the surface, our life is like the sea that is always in motion. Creed follows creed and leader replaces leader in ceaseless succession. Yet underneath, the great tides of faith and hope and love sweep their resistless way to their appointed goal. Whither are they moving? Who will interpret for us the trend of the ages? In contrast to the ideals of race and nation and school, who will embody for us the ideal of humanity as such? Who if not Jesus who knew what was in man, and who for that reason speaks always to that which is eternal in man?

There have been critics who have found fault with Jesus because of his aloofness from the special tasks of calling or class. What interest, they have asked, did he ever show in science or art or politics? What great book did he write? What picture did he paint? What discovery did he make? What lasting reform is labeled with his name?

Is there then no task for humanity more important than writing books, or painting pictures, or enacting laws? Is there no common ground on which artist and scientist and statesman can meet? If not, all our talk of brotherhood is empty words. But if there is such a common ground; if to be man is more than to follow any of the special callings which engage the energy and divide the interest of individual men, then we need someone to incarnate this common human ideal and to remind us, when we are tempted to forget them, of those universal aspirations which all men alike share. This unifying function Jesus fulfils in supreme degree. Just because of his aloofness from that which is local and divisive, he is fitted to be the representative of humanity as a whole.

We are dealing, not with theory, but with experience. I have spoken of Jesus as a Jew of the first century, and it is true that he is this. But he is far more than this. He is the central figure of human history, numbering among his disciples men of every age and of every land, the common meeting-ground of civilizations and of races. Here is a fact which needs explanation. And what better explanation can be found than that which was given centuries ago by Paul that "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself"?

We have considered the meaning of

Christ's deity for the past. We have seen that the motives which led the first disciples to their faith are still operative with us. It remains to ask briefly what is the kind of evidence by which its validity must finally be tested?

At no point is the contrast between the older and the newer methods in theology more apparent. The older apologists attempted a proof of Christ's deity which should have the force of a mathematical demonstration. They approached the problem as a problem of logic in which the important thing was to put your argument in such a form that the conclusion followed irresistibly from the premises. God is a being who possesses certain known qualities. Jesus Christ possesses these qualities; therefore Christ is God. In some such fashion the apologist constructed his syllogism. When the syllogism was complete his work was done. Henceforth the responsibility rested on those who refused to act upon the conclusion which he had established.

But we see today that the matter is not so simple. The proof of Christ's deity can never be independent of the personal religious experience, because in the nature of the case the argument involves the appeal to a continuing experience. For what is it that we wish to prove? Not simply that centuries ago God was incarnate in Christ (that might conceivably be established by purely historic arguments), but that Christ, in what we know of him today, represents what God is everywhere and always, and therefore remains forever the revelation of God. This is a far more important and more difficult matter. To do this we must be able to show that the Spirit of Christ is still the world-conquering spirit. This involves an appeal to present experience as well as to the experience of the past. To believe in Christ's deity means, as we have seen, to trust his power, to own his authority, and to reverence his character. But I cannot do this in any true sense until I have tested Christ in my own life and found him trustworthy, righteous, and adorable. There is no argument which can take the place of experiment. The most that one man can do for another is to tell of his own experiment and point him to Christ, that he may test the matter for himself.

This does not mean that we have not sufficient evidence for our faith. If what I have said is true of the transforming power of Christ in human life, we have evidence of the highest value, amply sufficient to justify our confidence and form the basis of our appeal. *But it means that the appeal must be made.* My experience cannot take the place of my neighbor's. If he is really to share my faith in the divine Christ he must put Christ to the proof in his own life.

This is the uniform assumption of the writers of the New Testament. To prove Christ's deity as Paul and John believed in it, it was not enough to establish the fact that for a few short years God had made his home in a human life. From the very beginning he had planned to make men like Christ, and the life that was led in Palestine was only an episode in a continuing ministry. Before the incarnation, the Word had been enlightening every man that came into the world. And after the resurrection the living Christ continued to draw all men to himself by his Spirit.

The same large conception of Christ's work lives on in the later theology. It lies at the heart of the doctrine of the Trinity. God is not simply the Father, infinite and eternal, ever contrasted with his creatures in majesty and power. He is not simply the Son, who lived and suffered and died, the Word made flesh, incarnate in Jesus for our salvation. He is the Spirit, who ever lives and works in the hearts of men, witnessing to them of Christ, their Savior, and transforming them, as they will receive him, into likeness to himself.

What kind of proof, then, must it be which shall convince all men of the deity of Jesus Christ? Clearly it can only be an all-embracing Christian experience. When Christ has really shown himself master of the world, when his ideals have proved themselves the conquering ideals, when humanity as a whole has owned his sway and is conformed to his character, when all men see God in him with the same clearness and certainty as is now the case with those who are consciously his disciples, then, and not till then, will our proof of his deity be finished and the apologist's work be done.

If, then, we would win men to our faith in the deity of Christ, our faces must be turned, not to the past, but to the future. You remember how it was with the disciples in those memorable hours which followed the crucifixion. Their thoughts were on the past, in those unforgetable days by the lake shore, when they had walked and talked with the Master who spake as never man spake. They were no less loyal to Christ than they had been before. But their loyalty was a sorrowful loyalty, for they never expected to see their Master's face again. Their Christ was a Christ of the past. They worshiped a Savior whose work was finished.

And then came Easter morning, and they realized that the Christ they had thought dead was alive. What a transformation it wrought in their whole outlook on life! Instead of looking backward they now looked forward to the new triumphs still to be won as they went out to proclaim that Jesus, once crucified, whom God had raised up and who now lived with him to reign forever and ever.

The church, too, like those early disciples, has often turned its face to the past. It has been tempted to think of God's work as all finished in what Jesus did nineteen hundred years ago in Palestine. In its adoration of the crucified Jesus it has sometimes forgotten the living and reigning Christ.

But thank God we are finding out our mistake. God's revelation did not stop with Calvary. It includes Easter and all that followed it. In our modern world of aspiration and struggle and longing, with its unanswered questions and its challenging opportunites, he is still at work, revealing and redeeming. He is calling us by his Spirit to be his interpreters to the new age, preparing the way for that better day when all men shall share our faith in the divine Christ because all shall share our experience of his transforming and enfranchising power.

THE PROBLEMS OF BOYHOOD

A COURSE OF ETHICS FOR BOYS IN THE SUNDAY SCHOOL

FRANKLIN W. JOHNSON
Principal of the University of Chicago High School

Study XVII. Loyalty

One of the finest qualities which a man can possess is loyalty. It finds its most common expression in our relations with our families and friends, with the social group of which we are a part, our school, club, or Sunday school; it reaches out to include our larger relations to our city, state, and country. Tell the story of Damon and Pythias. Mention some other illustrations of conspicuous loyalty. We despise one who is disloyal, e.g., Judas, Benedict Arnold. Mention some other illustrations of disloyalty.

What is the basis of loyalty? Your life was made possible at the cost of awful pain on the part of your mother. You represent a great expenditure of care and labor which your parents have given gladly which you will never be able to repay in kind. Reckon up the amount of money which your parents have invested in you up to this time. Discuss what it has cost in human life to give us the country in which we live. Contrast the political liberty which we enjoy with the condition of the people of Russia. At the time of the war in the Balkans, thousands of Greeks, Bulgarians, and representatives of the other Balkan states returned from this country to take up arms against the Turks. Why did they do this? How do you account for the loyalty of the many thousands of the people of the East Side in New York City to the political boss Tim Sullivan?

But there often seems to be some deeper basis for loyalty than that of service rendered or benefits received. There is such a thing as loyalty to a principle or an ideal. Why did Lafayette come to this country to fight by the side of Washington? At the time of the Boxer uprising in China, many native Christians gave up their lives. To what did they show their loyalty? The supreme illustration is the life and death of Jesus. To what was he loyal? Discuss the lives of William Lloyd Garrison and Elijah P. Lovejoy as examples of loyalty to principle. What are some of the ideals which demand your loyalty?

At times of crisis, loyalty is at its height. The recent outbreak of hostilities with Mexico was followed immediately by a large increase in the number of enlistments for the army and navy at the various recruiting agencies. It is easy then to respond to the demands of loyalty. In the less spectacular times of peace, there is no less need of loyalty. In what ways may we show our loyalty to our country without taking up arms?

There is often a conflict in the demands of loyalty. Show how this was true when in the Civil War members

of the same family fought on opposite sides. Jesus said (Matt. 10:35, 36): "For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." How has this been illustrated in the history of Christian missions? Give an illustration in which a man's loyalty to a friend would conflict with loyalty to his employer. Does loyalty to his school require a student to support the team in crooked practices? Should a boy ever "snitch" on his schoolmate? Does the expression "My country right or wrong" represent the highest type of loyalty?

Loyalty to a person, to a group, or to an ideal, when put to the test, must involve the spirit of self-sacrifice. Show how this has been the case with the examples given above. Cite some other examples. Professions of loyalty are easily made; the fulfilment of these professions is not always easy. Contrast Peter's vigorous expression of loyalty to Jesus (Matt. 26:35), "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee," with his thrice-repeated denial a few hours later (Matt. 26:69–75). Our discussions in previous studies should have set up in our minds certain ideals demanding loyalty. If you listen and laugh at the telling of a smutty story, even though you would not tell one yourself, are you loyal to the ideal of clean speech? How can you show your loyalty under such circumstances? What are some of the ideals to which you should show your loyalty?

Our President is the representative of a political party. Under ordinary circumstances, men do not think of loyalty to the country as necessarily demanding loyalty to the President. In times of crisis, however, such as the present, when our nation becomes involved in war with a foreign power, loyalty to a party is swallowed up in loyalty to the country. "Mr. Wilson was not my candidate, but he is my President" expresses this larger view of loyalty. The King of England is not a member of any party, but stands as the head of the entire nation, a central figure uniting the loyalty of all Englishmen. What advantage is there in this?

Topics for further discussion: In what ways may a boy show his loyalty to his school? Loyalty to the employer versus loyalty to the labor union.

Study XVIII. Citizenship

The Constitution of the United States declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside." This provision is not held to apply to Indian tribes and to the native inhabitants of the Philippine Islands and Porto Rico. On what grounds are these exceptions based? A child born abroad, whose father is an American citizen, is an American citizen under certain conditions. What are these? Is the child of an official representative of a foreign country, born in this country, a citizen of the United States? Is a Chinese or Japanese child born in this country a citizen of the United States? What are the requirements for the naturalization

of foreign-born citizens? According to the latest census, what proportion of the citizens were native born, foreign born, and children of foreign-born parents?

Citizenship carries with it certain privileges and obligations. The term "privileges" in the Constitution has been held to mean security to life and liberty, the right to acquire and hold property, to have access to the courts of justice, and freedom to seek and obtain happiness and safety so far as this may be done consistently with the public good. On what ground can the state prohibit the sale of liquor? Does citizenship confer the right to vote? By what steps can the privilege of the ballot be given to all women citizens of the United States? Inseparably bound up with these privileges are the obligations of citizenship. The government which secures for its citizens security to life and property must itself be supported by taxes levied upon its citizens and in time of need may call upon them to bear arms in its defense. A good citizen willingly pays his just share in the cost of maintaining his city, state, and nation. There is doubtless much evasion practiced by citizens in declaring their property to be taxed. If one man pays less than his fair share, others must pay more. For which is it easier to evade taxes, the rich or the poor? What is the justification of the income tax?

Germany requires military service of all able-bodied male citizens and maintains a large and efficient standing army. This country maintains a small standing army of volunteers. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages which the German system would have in this country. George Washington said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." Would this theory justify the maintenance of a large standing army? What do you think of the argument against woman suffrage that women cannot bear arms?

But citizenship should carry with it other obligations than the mere payment of taxes and the willingness, if need be, to bear arms in the country's defense. A good citizen will think less of the rights than he does of the social responsibilities which citizenship involves. Casting a ballot is no more a privilege than it is an obligation. Which is the more important, to vote at the primaries or at the final election? Why? What proportion of the legal voters in your city or town voted at the last election? Whose fault is it if the government of a city is corrupt? Is the corrupt political boss a necessity in city politics? Discuss the recent overthrow of Tammany Hall and the election of Mayor Mitchell in New York City. What reason is there for maintaining national party lines in city elections? Is it a fact that the best qualified men do not seek political office in our cities? If so, are they fulfilling their obligations as citizens?

The good citizen will be intelligent regarding the many forms of social service which his city and state undertake for the good of the community, such as the schools, libraries, hospitals, parks, playgrounds, and various institutions for the alleviation of suffering. It is more important to prevent ignorance, sickness, and crime than it is to care for those who suffer from the results of these evils. Mention the agencies in your

city or town which serve as preventives and those which deal chiefly with the evil results.

Besides those agencies supported at public expense, there are many voluntary organizations dealing with the problems of social betterment. A good citizen will be interested in these and will support them to the extent of his ability. Mention such of these agencies as are found in your community. Careful study has shown that much individual charity is ineffective. Scientifically organized charity is likely to accomplish much more good. Why is this? Are the needs of your community fully met by public and private organization? What changes would you suggest?

What opportunities has a boy of sixteen to secure training in good citizenship? How can well-conducted clubs and other organizations help to this end? What chances has a boy in high school to practice good citizenship? Compare the opportunities which you have with those which your father had, and consider the increased obligation which will fall upon you.

Study XIX. Clubs and Fraternities

Sociability is one of the most marked characteristics of the period of adolescent boyhood. Boys do not usually enjoy themselves alone. They naturally form groups for such team games as football and baseball, for debating or other similar activities. Aside from the pleasure which these activities afford, they enjoy the distinction which comes from holding offices such as president of a club or the captain of a team. Boys are particularly fond of wearing some distinctive emblem of the organization to which they belong, such as a pin or ring. An element of secrecy seems to add charm to these organizations of boyhood. How do you account for this?

Natural centers for these clubs are found in schools, churches, social centers, and the Young Men's Christian Association. In these there is usually found helpful co-operation on the part of older people which assures such supervision as to make these clubs generally beneficial to the boys. What clubs are there in your community and with what organizations are they connected? Clubs or "gangs" are sometimes formed, particularly in cities, which are related to no such organizations and which are frequently harmful in their effects upon their members. Do you know of any such?

There are many advantages to be gained from these organizations. They offer opportunity for forming close and helpful friendships, some of which last through life. They develop the qualities of leadership so essential to strong manhood. They provide helpful activities which afford valuable physical, intellectual, and social training. What other advantages can you think of? Discuss the advantages to be derived from some club of which you are a member.

There are also many disadvantages which may go with boys' clubs. They sometimes become so exclusive as to develop snobbishness. Under what circumstances is this likely to be the case? Why is such a club undesirable in a school? Sometimes the ideals of a club

are not high. The friendships formed in such a club are harmful. The expense involved is frequently greater than some of the members can afford. What other disadvantages can you think of? Discuss the disadvantages of any club of which you know. The most successful clubs are almost sure to be under the supervision of some mature man. What sort of man makes the best leader of a boys' club?

Fraternities within the last few years have been organized in many high schools. Great opposition has developed against these from school officials which has led in many cases to rules excluding them from the school. Several states have even passed laws prohibiting them. Recently college fraternities have expressed their disapproval and have taken action excluding from their membership boys who have been members of high-school fraternities. It is difficult for boys in school to understand this opposition and there has been a more or less successful effort to maintain the fraternities in spite of opposition against them. This has led to dishonest practices or open rebellion, harmful to the members themselves and to the proper social life of the schools.

Let us consider the reasons which have led to this opposition to high-school fraternities. The fundamental reason is that the fraternity is essentially undemocratic. The membership is usually limited in number and is open only to those who have been selected by all the members according to standards not generally known and often quite artificial, such as manner of dress or the ownership of an automobile. "Once a member, always a member," is the rule. A young boy, thus, often does not choose his permanent friends but is chosen by others before he is old enough to make so grave a choice for himself. He may find himself intimately associated with boys from whose friendship he cannot escape, even if he would, without danger of social ostracism. The members of a fraternity feel bound to promote their own members, often to the detriment of the school as a whole. Real values are lost sight of and captains of teams and other officers who are unfit are elected, through the scheming of fraternities. The interests of the larger social group represented by the school are thus set aside to promote the interests of the smaller group. Loyalty to the fraternity is placed above loyalty to the school. A study of actual conditions has shown that the scholarship of fraternity members is lower than that of other boys. The fraternity not only tends to set up false standards for social preferment, but also develops low moral standards among its members. This is particularly true in the matter of honesty, for boys who are members of fraternities are usually ready to lie to defend a "brother," apparently feeling that this is demanded of them as loyal members. Under some conditions, doubtless, high-school fraternities do not justly fall under these more serious charges. But of all, it may be said that they are essentially undemocratic and as such are out of harmony with the best interests of a school.

Are there fraternities in your school? If so, discuss their activities and influence in the light of these criticisms. Discuss fraternities among men, like the Masons. How can clubs be organ-

ized in the high school to satisfy the legitimate and desirable social needs of boys? Why are these better both for the individual boy and for the school as a whole? Discuss the kinds of clubs best suited to the church or Sunday school.

Study XX. The Idealism of Boyhood

Youth is the time of idealism. The poet has said, "A boy's will is the wind's will, and the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts." Every boy in his teens has his idea of the kind of man he wants to be and of the work he wants to do when he becomes a man. The ideals he sets for himself will vary at different times according to the change which nature is making inside him and to the surroundings in which he lives. At a certain time in their development, most boys want to live lives of wild adventure, at other times romance makes its appeal, and at still others, the serious pursuits of business or professional life. What different ideals have you had for your life?

Boyhood is a time of hero-worship. In a boy's mind there is pretty sure to be enthroned someone who represents the ideal he would like to reach. This may be the captain of the team, or some other great athlete; perhaps it may be his father or teacher; sometimes it may be a character in history or fiction. But whoever his ideal may be, this is a very real factor in the life of the boy. It makes a great difference what sort of a person you have set up as your ideal of attainment, for this ideal affects your present life and conduct profoundly. At different times the sort of person who seems to a boy most desirable to imitate varies, just as his plans for future occupation differ. Discuss the different persons whom you have most wished to be like at different times in your life.

Why is it that a boy's ideals are so changeable? While this is natural for a boy, it is very unfortunate for a man to have his ideals constantly changing. The changing ideals and purposes of boyhood should gradually settle down into the stable convictions of mature manhood. Such discussions as we have had regarding the problems of boyhood should have given us a more serious attitude toward life and should have helped to shape the ideal person whom we would like to be. In the light of these discussions, describe the characteristics of the kind of man you would like to be, physical, intellectual, moral.

Perhaps the word *gentleman* sums up better than any other single word, the qualities that should be found in a boy's ideal. We should not wish to use this term in the restricted sense that it once had in England as meaning a man who engages in no occupation or profession regularly for gain, but in the broader, more democratic sense in which the word is used in this country. Thomas Arnold used to say to the boys in the famous Rugby School, using the word in its broader sense, that it was not necessary that Rugby should be a school of any given number of boys, but that it was necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen.

Let us consider what it means to be a gentleman. To be a gentleman, must one wear a certain kind of clothes, speak a certain kind of language, or belong to a certain social set? What is the ad-

vantage of the externals which go with what we call good breeding? What are the fundamental qualities which mark the real gentleman? There are some things which a gentleman will never do. What are these? Will a gentleman ever lie? There are certain things which a gentleman will always do. What are these? What is the difference between a snob and a gentleman? Discuss in connection with your idea of a gentleman the teachings of Jesus regarding retaliation in Matt. 5:38–42, e.g., "But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

In a school the boys who are placed in prominent positions are regarded as representing the social ideals of the school. Is this conclusion always justified? If not, why? The captain of the football team is one of the strongest factors in the moral life of the school. Other captains and officers are important factors according to the importance which is attached to the position held. The younger boys in the school unconsciously have their ideals modified by the examples of these older boys. Are the boys holding these positions in your school worthy ideals for the other boys to follow? If not, whose fault is it?

The final test of a man's ideal is the man himself, for he tends to become like his ideal. The highest ideal which a man can follow is represented by Jesus, whose life embodies the fundamental qualities which are admirable. He said (John 12:32): "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." In what respects has the ideal of Jesus' life changed the lives of individuals and of society?

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE ON THE EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH. V

THEODORE GERALD SOARES, PH.D.
Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago

There will be a great advantage to the religious educator in coming into sympathy with the forward movements projected by leaders in the field of general education. We select for consideration two writings of Professor John Dewey, whose conception of education as a social process has had so marked an effect upon the educational world; also a book upon the kindergarten, for the attitude of that system of education is fundamental to a large realization of the problems in which we are interested; and also Dr. Montessori's presentation of her unique method, which contains so much of suggestion for the development of child life.

In a study which the writer has been carrying on for some years into the moral and religious influences that have been determining in the lives of theological students, it has been remarkable how small a place the day school and the Sunday school seem to have had. Individual teachers, of course, have been potent influences, but the schools as such have done little. Dewey's *Moral Principles in Education* indicates very clearly the reason for this inefficiency. The school is largely divorced from life. The child often says, "What good will this lesson ever do me?" and there is no adequate answer to his question. A prominent Sunday school recently presented an examination to its students in which several bright youngsters secured perfect grades and were duly heralded in the newspapers, but it is difficult to see that the ability to answer that series of questions on the Bible text would have the slightest influence in making the person a better member of society. And the remedy is not an insertion of specific moral instruction in the day school, nor an attempt to secure permission to read the Bible there, nor the tacking-on of moral teachings to the Sunday-school lesson. Morality is understandable only in relation to social life. Day and church school must relate themselves to the actual life that the people live in order to be morally significant. It is to be feared that Dewey's illustration of the swimming-school that attempted to teach people to swim without going into the water is all too illustrative of much of our educational endeavor.

Moral education involves the cultivation of the social spirit, a sense of value in the studies and activities of the school, the social interpretation of all the studies of the curriculum. It requires

adequate opportunity for the instincts and impulses of the individual to be so directed as to issue in habits of self-control and social service.

Dr. Dewey is not a mere theorist in this field. In his book *School and Society* will be found the practical methods by which in the experiment of the Elementary School at the University of Chicago he endeavored to work out his principles. The book presents the problem in which the modern school is involved by reason of the changes which make the complex society of today so difficult for the child to understand. Solution is to be found in attempting to understand first of all simpler social situations. How illuminating is the idea that all learning is advancement in social experience! When Dewey selects geography as central in education because of its richness in the development of the social imagination, some of us cannot forget the arid geography lesson when we had to depend upon sheer memory to tell whether cotton or olive oil was exported from Charleston.

The religious educator who is naturally called upon to give much attention to the teaching of the Bible will see at once what valuable material he has in hand from this point of view. In the simple pastoral life of the patriarchs, in the comparatively simple politics of the Hebrew state, in the elementary conditions of the Palestinian civilization, in the family and man-to-man morality with which Jesus dealt, it is possible to see the ethical principles of life more clearly than in our complex social order. Our business in biblical instruction is not so much to drag the past into the present as to cultivate a social imagination that will project the present into the past, enabling us to feel the quality of moral situations in that simpler time and thus appreciate the force of social obligation.

This book does not discuss the relation of the school to the church, but it is evident that in a community where education is being conducted in accordance with some of the larger insight which Dr. Dewey so conspicuously presents, the church will do well to study its task in the light of the school's endeavor. The growth of moral and religious values has been a part of that total growth of society which it is the business of education to make clear. The correlation of the instruction and activities of the church school and day school is one of the most vital problems now before us.

Every religious educator should have some clear conception of the meaning of kindergarten education. And this for the double reason that there should be a kindergarten in every church and that certain of the principles of Froebel are highly significant for religious education. As a matter of fact the kindergarten is generally misunderstood in the most absurd fashion. One minister recently, desirous of expressing emphatically the inefficiency of a mission Sunday school which had become nothing more than a place to take care of children on Sunday afternoon, stated that his church was using its money and strength for running a kindergarten. He meant, of course, a day nursery.

Nothing is easier than caricature. The "hard-headed" school trustee who regards every effort to socialize the curriculum as a mere addition of "fads and

frills" is the typical ignoramus ridiculing what he does not understand. It would be better to endeavor to appreciate a system of education devised by one of the world's great educational reformers who believed that the scientific study of the little child was worthy of the profoundest endeavors of scholarship. Superficially, the exercises of the kindergarten may seem the pleasing activities of the day nursery. Actually, they are the result of the most careful consideration of the psychological and physiological problems involved in the development of childhood.

The Kindergarten by Susan Blow, Patty Hill, and Elizabeth Harrison is in some sense a controversial book. For in this field, as in every other, there are the conservatives, who believe in preserving the great achievements of the past unchanged; the progressives, who think that each generation must interpret anew for itself the good of the old, daring to discriminate between the permanent and the incidental even in great teachings; and the moderates, who seek to concede something to the new thought but not too much. Inasmuch as these three reports were prepared with a view to standardizing the kindergarten program, it is evident that these educational leaders are nearer together in spirit than some conservatives and progressives in other spheres.

It will be noted that there are some differences in principle and some more marked differences in practice in these reports, but the presentation of the three views serves rather to make the whole system clear to the lay reader. The student of theology and of the psychology of religion will realize that we are finding a more satisfactory thought of God and of religion in terms of cosmic and of social process than in terms of the Absolute, which the more rigid followers of Froebel still employ.

The great significance of the kindergarten appears at once in its very conception of education, although in our schools and in our churches we are still under the thrall of the conception of education in terms of knowledge. We think of the importance of arithmetic, grammar, spelling, geography, history, etc. Our children must know these thoroughly and as soon as possible. And we think of Bible, church doctrine, plan of salvation, denominational history, facts of missions, as of supreme importance. How shall a person be religious unless he knows these? But these are all means and not ends. The kindergarten thinks of man's fundamental relations to nature, to his fellow-men, and to God, and conceives of an ideal relationship which might exist in which one would be in complete understanding with his natural environment so that it would serve his needs, material and aesthetic, and be in social relationship with his fellow-men, sharing with them the richness of human life and all its inheritance, and be in harmony with God in whom is the good, the true, the beautiful.

And how shall all this come about? Manifestly, not by taking our most important adult possessions and seeking to simplify them for childish apprehension, not by memorizing formulae either of grammar or of theology. The kindergarten word is "self-activity." The process of education is not from knowledge to knowledge but from experience

to experience. Left entirely to himself the child would learn very much by this process. He is continuously self-active, prying, testing, experimenting, acquiring skill by repetition, securing control of himself and of his environment, entering into the larger experience of his elders through language. Education is the expert guidance of this natural process. To the superficial observer the child in the kindergarten seems to be forever engaged in trivial amusement, for we are still under the domination of the idea that sound education must, of necessity, be disagreeable. In reality the games, stories, conversations, songs, manual industry, constructions, exercises, pets, drawings, and dancing are specific endeavors to direct the self-activity of the child in the best and most natural development for self-realization and social efficiency. He is finding himself and finding his relation to the world and to the social order, past, present, and future, of which he is a part and in which he is to be a contributing factor.

Froebel had intended to develop a complete system of education but the great demands and opportunities of childhood prevented him from carrying his ideas beyond that sphere. He would have devised a system in which self-activity should be supreme. He was, of course, dominated by a religious ideal, conceiving of religion in large and inclusive terms. The religious educator may find in the kindergarten fundamental principles that he needs. For what is religious education but a progressive socialization, helping the immature personality to be at home in his world with nature, with man, and with God?

The Montessori Method is the book in which Dr. Maria Montessori has presented to American readers her interesting system of education. This book has been enthusiastically heralded by some as destined to revolutionize all education, and of course, by others, has been the subject of the easy ridicule to which anything new is exposed. Soberly considered, the methods and experiments of Dr. Montessori deserve our careful consideration and promise to make some valuable contributions to our educational theory and practice.

The book is well worth reading for its fascinating account of the formation of the "children's houses," a notable and wise philanthropic endeavor in connection with the model tenements in Rome. And it is important to keep in mind this peculiar social environment in estimating the possibility of any transfer of the Montessori procedure.

The fundamental principle of this system goes to the heart of child-training whether at home or at school. It is the principle of liberty. The teacher is largely an observer, at most a director. The child educates himself with carefully devised didactic material which, for the most part, enables him to discover and rectify his own errors, and which is so natural an opportunity for his activities that he spontaneously desires to work with it.

Madame Montessori uses the word "work" while the kindergarten often speaks of play. There is no fundamental difference between these. Phillips Brooks expressed that splendid sense of the joy of doing a significant work for which one is well fitted when he said, "It is fun to be a minister." It is the dull monotony of modern industry that

has made the harsh distinction between work and play. Nothing can be more erroneous than the common notion that children are lazy. They are always at work. Montessori points out the grave wrong that we do children in serving them instead of allowing them to serve themselves. Most suggestively she remarks that much of the ill temper and rebelliousness of children comes from their being frustrated in their natural efforts to do things by meddling parents or teachers who are forever making their activities impossible. She would teach children to wash themselves, dress themselves, keep the room in order, take out their own materials and put them back, serve one another in common meals; and she finds them delighting to be useful. Of course it is easier to do things for children than to let them laboriously learn to do them for themselves. And this fact explains very much of the failure of home training.

The Montessori method has been misunderstood in the supposition that the principle of liberty means that the child may do as he pleases. He may do everything good that he pleases but nothing wrong. He may not interfere with others, annoy them, act rudely. If he does he is regarded as needing special attention. He is removed from the group, isolated, given toys to play with, but not permitted to be a member of the working body. He soon desires to return and find his place. Everything active, constructive, experimental, investigative is good, and he may do as he will and go from one thing to another as he will, indoors or out. The important endeavor is made that he shall not associate immobility with goodness and activity with evil. Discipline through liberty, inhibition of undesirable activities by the large opportunity for good activities—these are the principles employed. Of course the teacher is constantly present to stimulate the child by introducing him to significant activities. There are some great practical difficulties here, but the general principles involved are sound.

The discussion of will is very significant for religious education. Montessori puts little emphasis on obedience, which is supposed to be a golden virtue of childhood, and this for the simple reason that she regards obedience as a later development of which young children are incapable. Will is, of course, self-directed activity, and therefore willpower can be developed only through the process of activity. That the child often cannot obey is a simple psychological fact.

We need not discuss her theory that the religious sentiment is a native instinct that is to be encouraged. It is enough to agree most heartily that the performance of religious acts is a natural social participation of the child in the experiences of its elders and is of great educational value.

It would be interesting to consider in detail the materials for the education of sense and particularly the method of teaching children of four years to write, which Montessori regards as perfectly natural. But this review need not be extended, for the admirable introduction to the book by Professor H. W. Holmes is a most discriminating estimate of the Montessori system as regards its value for American education, and also a comparison with the American kinder-

garten system with some suggestions as to a possible combination. It is noteworthy that Miss Hill in her kindergarten report, which we have already discussed, advocates some use of the Montessori material.

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

1. To what extent is the American school a real democracy?

2. Is the Bible a literature of social experience? If so, what does this imply as to its religious value?

3. Would it be desirable for the church to have a school for three hours on Sunday morning with significant activities related to the social needs of the children?

4. A certain child stated that he liked the day kindergarten but not the Sunday kindergarten. Is there anything in the kindergarten that is not suitable for Sunday?

5. Is there any danger of the progressive kindergarten losing something of the religious quality which Froebel considered so important?

6. What could be done in our tenements for establishing "children's houses," in which the life of the children would be directed eight or nine hours a day?

7. What points in the Montessori system seem to be suggestive for American children?

SOME FURTHER WORKS

John Dewey, *The Child and the Curriculum.*
Irving King, *Social Aspects of Education.*
Perry, *Wider Use of the School Plant.*
Griggs, *Moral Education.*
M. V. O'Shea, *Social Development and Education.*
Friedrich Froebel, *Education of Man.*
Bowen, *Froebel and Education through Self-Activity.*
Foster, *The Kindergarten in the Church.*

SUGGESTIONS TO LEADERS OF CLASSES USING THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS

In presenting the work of the current month the leader will find a wonderful opportunity to emphasize the essential principle which lies back of the entire course of study which the class has pursued, viz., the historical conditions out of which any individual book arose, and the color given to the book because of current thought at the time of its origin. A lifetime of study is necessary to get the fullest appreciation of this principle as illustrated in the Gospel of John, but the most artificial student of this course cannot fail to catch something of the principle and to find his sense of the personality back of the book enhancing its living interest and value to him.

It happens that two interesting poems from the pen of Robert Browning are associated with this book—"Karshish, the Arab Physician," which gives a most interesting conception of the attitude of a contemporary physician toward the story of the raising of Lazarus, and "The Death in the Desert," which is the result of the poet's meditation upon the last hours of John the disciple. We consider that a review of these poems in this connection would add still further interest to the study of John's Gospel.

We also suggest that a good deal of time be spent in the latter part of the month on the discussion of the value of the historical study of the Bible. Members of the group should be pushed to the point of expressing themselves as to what it really means, and what it has contributed to their own appre-

ciation of the New Testament. The close of the year's work should leave them with such an impression of the value of this method that they will recognize its bearing in all future Bible study.

If members of the group have not had a survey of the Old Testament from the historical point of view, this course should lead them to undertake such a study and so complete their general impression of each book of the Bible. Only after a survey of this kind can one truly differentiate between what is temporary and what is permanent in the teaching of the biblical books, and so take up into their own religion the principles which will vitalize and strengthen it. In the two programs which follow no special task has been assigned for the leader, because it seemed best to leave him free to discuss any phase of the work most needed for the group which he is leading. It will also be noted that there are many more questions for discussion noted in the programs than has ordinarily been the case.

Program I

Members: (1) How important is it that we should know whether John or one of his followers was the author of the Gospel of John? (2) Has this gospel become the favorite among Christians? If so, why? (3) If you had lived in the first century, would you have been a believer in John the Baptist, or in Jesus, as the Messiah? Why? (4) Why were second-century Christians so concerned with the divinity of Christ when those of the first century had not so greatly emphasized it? (5) When in the teaching of Jesus according to John may eternal life begin? (6) Reading of the Lazarus story, chap. 11. (7) Reading of Browning's "Karshish, the Arab Physician."

Program II

Members: (1) A study of the characters which appear in the last week of Jesus' life as the author of John presents them: Peter, Mary of Bethany, Pilate, Judas, John the disciple. (2) The prayer discourse of Jesus. (3) The picture of Jesus presented by the Gospel of John alone, and an estimate of our loss in case we had no other gospels to depend upon. (4) The use of the Gospel of John for evangelistic purposes.

Questions for discussion: (1) Practical results which have been obtained from the study of this course. (2) Of what importance is it to the understanding of biblical books to know the history which lies back of them? (3) Does such study increase or diminish the religious value of the books for our own day?

REFERENCE READING

Weizsacker, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*, II, 206–40; von Soden, *The History of Early Christian Literature*, pp. 374–459; Weiss, *Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 355–401; Peake, *Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 170–228; Julicher, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 383–429; Moffatt, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 475–82, 515–619; Scott, *The Apologetic of the New Testament*, Lecture 5; Wrede, *The Origin of the New Testament*, pp. 75–91, 115; Burton, *Short Introduction to the Gospels*, chap. v; Pullan, *The Gospels*, pp. 243–316. Note below the large number of important books entirely devoted to the discussion of the Gospel of John. Worseley, *The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists;* Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel;* Drummond, *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel;* Stevens, *The Johannine Theology;* Luthard, *St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel;* Wrede, *The Gospel according to John;* Gloag, *Introduction to the Johannine Writings;* Schmeidel, *The Johannine Writings;* Scott, *The Fourth Gospel.* Volumes on the Gospel of John may be found in the *Expositor's Bible*, the *Century Bible*, the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges;* and in the *International Critical Commentary*, a volume on the Johannine Epistles. Hastings' four-volume *Dictionary of the Bible* contains articles on the Gospels, John the Apostle, and the Epistles of John; Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, an article on John the Apostle, and the Gospel of John.

CURRENT OPINION

The Evolution of the System of Ritschl

Ritschlianism was the biggest theological factor in the second half of the nineteenth century and is still a living system. In the *London Quarterly Review* for January, 1914, Dr. H. R. Mackintosh studies in "Ritschlianism Old and New" the evolution of this great system. Ritschl meant to give unity and freedom to the Christian consciousness by taking as the touchstone of religious thought not a creed but a living and immediate faith in God through Jesus Christ. In respect to the thought of God, of sin, of redemption, of Christian perfection, we ought to ask, first of all: What truth about these subjects is certified by faith in Jesus? Theology must be written from the point of view of the specifically Christian mind: religious knowledge is the knowledge of a religious man; nobody can understand it who is not personally a believer, the unbeliever is as little of an expert in religion as a dog in a picture-gallery. Truth in religion is attained by avenues different from those employed in scientific or historical research. As for metaphysic, it does not really touch the problems which most concern religious people; it has nothing to say on sin and forgiveness, on prayer and the self-consciousness of Jesus. Christ is a unique universal and complete revelation of the grace of God, he is the principle of knowledge at every point in religious thought. Christian truth is further vitally related to the church as a society called into existence by divine intention. Ritschl did not think out his system of the church as completely as other parts of his dogmatics but he rightly insisted upon the church taking once again something like the subduing and commanding place it receives in the Scriptures, at the very center of the spiritual experience. The church is the vehicle by which Christian worship goes down from generation to generation; it is the historic medium through which primitive faith touches men of today; it is the first and proper object of justification so that we are forgiven because we belong to a forgiven society; thus and thus only. Ritschlianism held such a wonderful sway for three reasons: first, because it planted faith on the rock of historic fact; secondly, because of the fidelity of Ritschl to the ideal and essence of the Reformation; thirdly, because for him the Christian religion stood for power and spiritual health. Harnack said in 1897 that Ritschl was the latest "Church Father." Certainly his system is now in circulation more widely than is always recognized; whatever we may think of Ritschl's conclusions, it remains that his method has been more generally adopted than we should think. Disciples of Ritschl have freely criticized their master. This attitude to critical tendencies was fairly cool. He considered, for instance, the kingdom of God as a purely ethical conception and did not take into account the apocalyptic hopes of the time of Jesus. He was averse to sentimentalism and scarcely gave to the doctrine of eternal life a proper place in his system. This conception of sin was perhaps external and cold, hence his notion of the redeemer does not seem to be complete. In fact he has been too much under the influence of Kant. Thus, for instance, it was Kant who taught him to say that the divinity of Christ is his perfection of moral character; yet this is only one element of the truth. It is also a Kantian idea that we are related to the glorified Lord only through our knowledge of the historical Jesus. Certainly St. Paul did not think so and Christians know how their spiritual life implies the presence and activity of Christ

in a mode transcending time and space. Radical or liberal disciples of Ritschl have not improved his system. Their attacks on the supernatural will never persuade a Christian who knows that faith in the living God can never be tabulated in terms of law, evolution, and uniformity which are after all categories of the mind. A certain misty conception of historical events in connection with faith is no advance on the Ritschlian conception of history and the church as sources of truth. In conclusion, Dr. Mackintosh says that the fundamental principles on which Ritschl built his system remain true: Christianity rests on the historic Christ, and, in the experience of the redeemed, sonship by grace is the central and organizing fact and the basis of theology.

Does Adam Mean One Man or Mankind?

Does the word "Adam" as used in the creation story mean one person or mankind in general? is the subject treated by Dr. J. Boehmer in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* for January, 1914, in an article entitled: "Wieviel Menschen sind am letzten Tage des Hexaemerons geschaffen worden?" Dr. Boehmer thinks that the word "Adam" is collective, first because in the creation story the words translated by the English version, grass, herbs, fruit-trees, swarms of living creatures, birds, are collectives in Hebrew (and not plural forms); we should expect that Adam would be also a collective. Moreover, in Gen. 1:26 God says: "Let us make man [or mankind] in our image . . . . and let *them* have dominion," etc. The only way to explain the use of the plural here is to assert that the writer means the first man and his wife. But Old Testament writers did not hold such a high conception of woman as to associate her with man in the lordship over the universe on an equal footing with man. Dr. Boehmer says that a religion of which the sign of initiation is circumcision, which ranks woman with the animals as a helpmeet for man (Gen. 2:18 ff.), which even now requests of her devotees to repeat in the synagogue "Blessed be thou, O Lord, our God, Eternal King, because thou hast not made me a woman," a religion which has put even in our own New Testament traces of the Semitic low conception of woman, certainly could not make woman a ruler with man over the whole creation. We should therefore understand the word "man" in the story of the sixth day of creation as meaning mankind. The thesis of Dr. Boehmer is not new but it is ably put forth.

Things New and Old

The modern man lacks religious imagination, says John Edwards Lebosquet, writing on "The Modern Man's Religion" in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January, 1914. For instance, he does not care very much for immortality. Mr. Winston Churchill in his recent novel, *The Inside of the Cup*, studies a number of vital questions, from what is, after all, the modern man's point of view, but he is silent on the belief in immortality. Mr. Lebosquet thinks that the dislike of modern men for authority and dogmas springs from the same lack of imagination. Not that the modern man despises authority as such but he wants to find a reason for obeying. For this same reason the church is practically ignored: it is not hated but it is bowed out of practical life. This again is owing to the lack of imagination: the modern man does not seem to understand very clearly that a church may be up to date while it is an ancient institution. The modern man, however, is not skeptical or indifferent for all that. If he does not encumber himself with dogmas and does not see the beauty of religious symbolism, it is again lack of imagination; the value of the symbolic, whether in creed or in ritual, eludes the modern man. Modern creeds like Christian Science and New

Thought are strong in their suppression of what they call vain imaginings of fear and sickness. Modern comforts lull the modern mind to forget dreams of a future life, modern research has clipped the wings of fancy so that the world of a modern man is after all very limited and his religion has become narrow in its visions and outreachings. These negative aspects, however, are only the obverse of positive religious assets: if the average modern man is rather proud of his indifference to immortality it is because he insists upon his concern with present tasks and opportunities; he rejects authorities because he feels intensely the value of the individual; he neglects church-religion because he prefers to be busied with what is more practical; so that the modern man's religion, in spite of its shortcomings, shows a great deal of creative power in the sphere of improvement and usefulness. How different, for example, are the Eastern pundit who submits to Fate and the American who does not wait for things to happen but goes ahead and makes them happen; and this is religion as well, although of a different kind. The modern man has sympathy for the needy; he will be roused by injustice; he cannot pass by suffering unmoved; the ancient religious man could do so but the modern world, although it calls itself sometimes irreligious, has been Christianized in its feelings and the brotherhood of man has become a never-failing spring of action; we may lack horizon and have a slight sense of the historic faith but after all the religion of man was never so free from selfish motives, never so vital and sincere as now. Moreover, signs are not wanting that what is lacking in the modern man's religion attracts again the interest of an élite and we can hope to see a synthesis of intellectual clarity and a sense of historical symbolism with this practical idealism which is the glory of our religious life of today.

A Plea for Biblical Archaeology

In the *Open Court* for April, 1914, Mr. G. H. Richardson writes on "The Value of Archeological Study for the Biblical Student." Too many preachers depend for information on old books which are now out of date in many of their statements. Mr. Richardson heard a minister quoting Canon Farrar to the effect that the Ten Commandments were the earliest historic code which has come down to us. Evidently the name of Hammurabi and of his code written a thousand years before Moses was unknown to that preacher. In another instance pictures of the death of Samson are shown in Sunday schools which represent the hero of Israel tearing down huge stone pillars. We know from Professor MacAlister's excavations at Gezer that the portico of the temple of Gezer was supported by pillars resting on column bases. It may be supposed that a strong man could move these pillars out of the perpendicular, seeing that they merely rested on the top of the stone base, and then the weight of the building would push them off their bases. A third instance of inaccuracy could easily be cured if more attention were paid to archaeological results. Certain professors still use the name of New Testament or biblical Greek to designate the language of the New Testament. We know, however, from the Greek papyri discovered in Egypt that the language used by the writers of the New Testament is just the kind of Greek that simple folk used at that time. One after another, the so-called "Hebraisms" of the New Testament have been exactly paralleled in the papyri and ostraca. Deissmann estimated that the total number of "biblical" words in the New Testament is not more than 1 per cent of the whole vocabulary. Study of archaeology makes the ancient East more living to us and can be made as interesting as any other science.

The Pre-existence of Jesus

In the *American Journal of Theology* for January, 1914, Mr. R. H. Strachan writes on "The Idea of Pre-existence in the Fourth Gospel." The Prologue of the Gospel of John identifies Jesus with the Logos, but in such a way that we must regard the Prologue as a preface composed after the rest of the gospel was written and intended to commend it to the Greek world. For the Prologue, the Logos is the agency through which the world was created; it is clear that the writer has in view Gen., chap. 1, and experiences, in common with later Jewish thinkers, a certain unwillingness to bring God in immediate contact with the world. It is not, however, the conception of the creative activity of the Logos that determines the evangelist's conception of the person of Jesus Christ, but rather the other way: the writer has reflected upon the miracles and the teaching and the life of Jesus and as the outcome of his meditation has identified Jesus with the *Memra* or the Logos. Indeed, it would be difficult to explain how a preconceived notion of the identity of Jesus with the creative activity of the Logos would have led the author of the Fourth Gospel to choose as typical such miracles as the Cana miracle, the feeding of the five thousand, the walking on the water, or the raising of Lazarus. It is easier to conceive how these stories suggested, and were not suggested by, the idea of universal creative activity. Hence the pre-existence of Jesus outside of the Prologue is the pre-existence of one who is more than the Messiah, and yet not the pre-existence of a divine Logos, by which the worlds were created. The object of the gospel is plainly to prove that Jesus is the Christ. In this respect the thought of the pre-existent activity in the gospel itself is less wide in scope than in the Prologue. In the gospel itself the word λογός means the intimate relationship between Jesus and the Father; this relationship confers everlasting life. Jesus claims, therefore, that he is greater than Abraham (John 8:56). The Jews answer at once that this is absurd, since he, Jesus, is not fifty years old, and therefore has not yet attained to perfect manhood. Jesus answers, enigmatically as it seems, "Before Abraham was born, I am." In order to investigate the nature of the pre-existence attributed to Jesus here we must study the Jewish conception of pre-existence. The Talmud teaches a real pre-existence of the Messiah in a premundane form. This talmudic doctrine is late and post-Christian, it is true, but it is impossible to believe that it was influenced by Christian thought. The influence of Christian thought upon Jewish messianic beliefs acted rather in the opposite direction. We may therefore accept a pre-Christian date for the Similitudes of Enoch and the conception of a pre-existent Messiah found there. We are here in the presence of a powerful trend of Jewish thought which probably exercised an influence on the mind of Jesus himself. The pre-existence of the Messiah is hinted in Dan. 7:13, 14 and taken for granted in Enoch. Mr. Strachan thinks that Jesus used apocalyptic imagery in moments of special exaltation as a form of self-expression. The Fourth Gospel embodies an apocalyptic conception rather than the Logos-conception of the Prologue. The author does not merely repeat, like the synoptists, traditional apocalyptic utterances of Jesus—he moves with freedom and ease amid the apocalyptic ideas that his Master chose as forms of self-expression; he treats these, in fact, like other parts of the teaching of Jesus, interpreting them through his own consciousness of their religious value and signification.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

Mohammedan Apologetics

In the *Asiatic Review* for January and February, 1914, Khwaja Kamaluddin, editor of the *Islamic Review*, writes on "Islam, Christianity and Other Religions of the World." The article is strangely misleading. The author quotes the Koran with a freedom that would not be tolerated in a scientific magazine. Possibly he has a new version of the Koran, certainly it is not the one we know. Khwaja Kamaluddin's argument is that God cannot have been without a witness in every nation. So Mohammed was the prophet of Arabia as Jesus was the prophet of the Jews and Buddha one of the divine messengers to India. Islam sums up other religions: the Koran is written in the richest and the most conservative language of the world; it is more than a collection of prayers, fastings, and sacrifices—it is a complete code of life.

So far there is nothing very extraordinary. But Mr. Kamaluddin brings in some new theories. He says that Islam is the fulfilment of other religions: each and all of them do believe in the fundamental principles of Islam; their minor differences among themselves have no bearing on the religion. Does Mr. Kamaluddin call belief in the existence of God and life after death a minor difference? Can a man be a Mohammedan and read the Nirvana into the description of Mohammed's heaven? If he does he will secretly despise the present form of the teaching of Islam. He who believes in the incarnations of God in Avatars or in the incarnation of God in Christ will certainly be called a "divider" of God by any Mohammedan who knows and believes the catholic creed of Islam. Moreover, Mr. Kamaluddin throws a stone at Christians because they are divided. We are very sorry they are, but is Islam without sects and party-spirit and heretics? In fact, the kind of Islam that some Europeans have accepted has always been Islam *cum grano salis*. It seems that Lord Morley, the Irish lord who announced his conversion to Islam, was enlightened by a man of the school of Khwaja Kamaluddin. He was strangely mistaken: the religion of the editor of the *Islamic Review* is not Islam but is Islamic heresy.

Zionism and the Continuance of Judaism

Dr. E. W. Masterman, writing in the *East and West* for April, 1914, on "Zionism and Christian Missions," says that many leaders of Jewish thought today think that there is no choice between Nationalism—of which Zionism is the only form likely to be generally accepted—and gradual assimilation to the nations. They feel that a national idealism is needed to keep the non-religious Jews who are fast increasing in numbers faithful to the community. Zionism for this reason commands the support of many rationalistic and even thoroughly materialistic Jews. Strange to say, the fall of the late sultan of Turkey, Abdul Hamid, has been a severe blow to Zionism. The young Turks, who seem to be less liberal than the older generation of Turkish leaders, show no inclination to grant political rights to the Jews of Palestine and to allow the creation of a kind of state within the state. Perhaps the late sultan could have been bought over to this view. At least Zionists thought so. But it is too often forgotten by Jews and Christians that Palestine is as sacred to the Mohammedan as to themselves. The religious prestige of the sul-

tan would be badly damaged if he lost control over such centers as Jerusalem, "the Holy," as the Arabs call it, and Hebron. The Zionists have therefore forsaken hopes of political semi-independence for a Jewish state in Palestine and are confining themselves to the peaceful method of colonization by Jewish emigrants. Great sums of money have been lavished upon Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine; the results have sometimes been disappointing, but it must be remembered that Palestine has greatly suffered from foreign invaders and especially from the careless policy of Mohammedan rulers, so that the land will not support a larger population without a vast expenditure of capital. Palestine is a very small country, poor, without mineral wealth; water is scarce and for nearly half the year there is no rainfall at all. No industry promising much wealth has been discovered. Wine-making does not bring in much profit. Oranges cannot be grown in any but well-watered districts and such are rare. The best lands have already been appropriated and east of the Jordan there are large colonies of fanatical Mohammedans who would make impossible the life of any Jewish settlers in their midst. As for the lower plains, these are unhealthy for European Jews, especially north European Jews. Even in the upper lands malaria, ophthalmia, and tuberculosis are more rife among the Jews than among the indigenous inhabitants. However, there are signs of progress. Sixty or seventy years ago there were less than 10,000 Jews in Palestine; now they number over 150,000. They allow the widest possible latitude in matters of faith and skepticism so long as the national bond is recognized but they greatly oppose Christian missions. A man may believe what he will and be a Zionist as long as he is not baptized, but baptism puts him forever outside the pale. He is opposed, ostracized, and abused at every opportunity. Converted Jews are excluded from Zionist societies. This is not logical. If Judaism is a religion, then a very large number of Zionists are not Jews; if Judaism is a nationality, the question of religion should have nothing to do with national rights, and there should be room for the Christian Jew along with the orthodox, the reformed, and the free-thinking Jew. The Christian missionaries in Palestine look upon Zionism with sympathy and only wish that more recognized co-operation were possible. While Zionism is expected to retain much of the genius of the Jewish religion, such an organization, especially if it crystallizes into a Jewish state, ought not to ostracize the greatest Jewish teacher, Jesus of Nazareth.

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

THE GROWTH OF HEBRAISM[1]

W. G. JORDAN, D.D.
Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

This volume is dedicated to the memory of the late Dr. Charles Augustus Briggs as a "warm-hearted friend, accomplished scholar, devoted disciple of the Master, valiant defender of the faith." The purpose of the book is

> an endeavor to give an intelligible account of the rise and progress of Israel's religion from its beginnings in the nomadic period down to the tragic event which put an end to the Jewish state. . . . . All that the book claims for itself is that it represents our present knowledge; what the future has in store for us we cannot forecast. . . . . The reader who is not a specialist may safely assume that I have not taken any position without examining the arguments for and against.

These words from the preface show clearly the nature and purpose of the volume. It is not hampered with any critical apparatus, there is no bibliography, and only in a few cases are direct references given to works by other scholars. Only those who have given much study to the general history and its particular problems can appreciate fully the amount of learning and toil involved in the production of such a work, but the non-specialist reader may gain from it a clear outline of the course of Israel's religious development, while it may serve as an admirable textbook in the hands of a competent teacher. Dr. Smith, as we might expect, thinks that the time has gone by for calling the subject "Old Testament theology" or for discussing, in this connection, the distinction between canonical and non-canonical literature. It is a historical problem, the aim being "to trace the history of Israel's religion from the earliest discoverable stages down to the Christian era." This calls, at the close, for a summary of the teaching contained in post-canonical books ending with a reference to the so-called Book of Ezra. The divisions adopted are (1) nomadic religion, (2) agricultural religion, (3) prophetism, (4) legalism. The subject is developed in twenty chapters beginning with "Nomadic Religion," "Moses and His Work" (i and ii) down to "The Treasure of the Humble" and "The Final Stage" (xix and xx). The author has succeeded in a marvelous manner in touching a great variety of subjects, suggesting the richness and complexity of the subject, and yet marking a clear path and maintaining a steady movement from beginning to end. So much is this the case that one is surprised to find any detail of importance omitted; e.g., the reviewer, after noting that the author accepts the order, Yahwist Decalogue (p. 111), Book of the Covenant (p. 113), Deuteronomy (p. 187), wished to know where the decalogue Exod. 20:1–20 was placed but could find no reference to it. One may conjecture that it is regarded as substantially parallel to the Deuteronomic decalogue. This is a small thing, and one is compelled to add that it is remarkable how much information regarding the men and the books of those days the writer manages to give without losing himself in a mass of detail or being driven from his main purpose, which is to show that there was a real development from a simple, in

[1] *The Religion of Israel: An Historical Study.* By Henry Preserved Smith. New York: Scribner, 1914. Pp. 369. $2.50.

some respects "superstitious," nomadic and peasant religion to a prophetic religion with a real ethical character and universal implications. The basis of the treatment is a radical but not an extreme criticism; in fact, it is a criticism which we think may be called conservative in the best sense. While admitting the scantiness of the records and the uncertainty that must forever attach to many details, the author claims that a living movement may be traced from the "Mosaic period" onward. The extreme positions of Cheyne and Winckler are not mentioned and recent attacks on the documentary theory or attempts to check literary criticism from the side of Babylonian mythology (e.g., Gressmann and Welch) have left no influence on this book. In the light of these recent discussions one turns with interest to the subject of the messianic hope, which is treated in three chapters: xiv, "The Messianic Hope"; xv, "The Spiritualization of the Messianic Hope"; and xviii, "Apocalyptic Development of the Messianic Hope." This hope, which assumed varied forms, had its roots in earlier teaching but received its more definite expression in the struggles of post-exilic times: "whether it pictured the reign of Yahweh or whether it looked for a son of David . . . . the messianic hope kept the Jews faithful to their religion and obedient to their Law." The spiritualization of this hope is attributed largely to Deutero-Isaiah, and Dr. H. P. Smith leans to the collective interpretation of "the servant." Notwithstanding the rationalizing tendencies at work, as shown by Ecclesiastes, under the stress of persecution this hope increased in vigor. "It took new and fantastic forms, and the more ardent spirits even ventured to calculate the time of the end," etc. The reviewer finds himself in general sympathy with the position taken in this book, and is not expected to take up space in the discussion of subordinate questions; hence he may bring to a close this slight notice by congratulating Dr. H. P. Smith on the completion of such an admirable textbook and wishing for it a useful career.

BOOK NOTICES

Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions [The Haskell Lectures delivered at Oberlin College in 1913, and since revised and enlarged.] By Morris Jastrow, Jr. New York: Scribner, 1914. Pp. xviii+376. $2.50.

Amid the many volumes of the past few years making extravagant claims for Babylonian influence upon Hebrew religious thought, it is a relief to come across one like this that stays within the domain of historical probability. Professor Jastrow's great work on Babylonian religion has made him widely known as an authority in that field. This work shows him to be thoroughly at home in the domain of Hebrew religion. The purpose of this book as conceived by its author is "to indicate not merely the points of divergence between the two civilizations that started out with much in common, but more particularly to indicate why, with important traditions and beliefs so close to one another as to be practically identical, we find the Hebrews proceeding along a line of development which gradually transformed these traditions and beliefs into a medium for expressing the highest spiritual aspirations of the human race and led to one of the most impressive endeavors to find a solution for the mysteries by which we are surrounded" (p. 255). It may fairly be said that Professor Jastrow has clearly indicated some of the ways in which the Hebrew religious thought manifested its superior character and some of the steps by which it gradually rose to higher things, but he can hardly be said to have discovered or made plain the cause which made the Hebrews achieve higher values than did the Babylonians. We can easily register the fact of superiority, but we are often baffled to account for it. The traditions selected for consideration in this volume are those of the creation and the Sabbath, those concerning life after death, and the ethical teachings.

The chapter on the Sabbath is an admirable

statement of the facts. Professor Jastrow, in his article in the *American Journal of Theology* for 1898, was one of the first to call attention to the resemblance of the Babylonian to the Hebrew Sabbath. Some of the positions then taken are allowed to drop out of sight here. The early observance of the Hebrew Sabbath is now granted and the marked difference of that early Sabbath from the Babylonian observance. It is to be borne in mind too, as Jastrow notes, that the term "Sabbath" thus far has been found in Babylonian literature to designate no day but that of the full moon. The Babylonians had other special terms for the day of the new moon and also for the day of the moon's final disappearance. Why the Hebrews came to apply the special term "Sabbath" to every seventh day is as yet unknown. Tucked away in a footnote on p. 284 is an original contribution to the interpretation of Jonah. This much-maligned book is made by Jastrow a "satirical narrative aimed against the tendency of the prophets to foretell disasters." This view of the book's purpose can hardly be taken seriously. Jonah was written not by a satirist but by a lover of men. Jastrow puts the origin of the similarities between Hebrew and Babylonian ideas and practices back in the days antedating the entry of the Hebrews into Canaan, even in pre-Abrahamic times. This is hardly necessary, it would seem, with so many generations of contact between Hebrew and Canaanite culture, extending back into pre-Mosaic days. Until we can be more certain of our sources of information for the days of Abraham and his forbears, it is better to rest content with the intercommunications between Babylonian thought and Hebrew that were so inevitable on the soil of Palestine itself.

In the treatment of so large a subject as this, differences of interpretation are bound to arise. The value of this book lies in the fact that it will undoubtedly commend itself almost throughout to a very large number of competent scholars. It is a most sober and illuminating discussion of a great and important problem.

Christianity between Sundays. By George Hodges. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. 267. $1.25.

A vital collection of sermons by the dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Another sign of the tidal drift away from emphasis upon dogma. It is coming to be recognized, says Dr. Hodges, that a man might accept and believe and teach the Thirty-nine Articles, or the Westminster Confession, or the Catechism of Trent, and yet be only in the position of those jostlers in the crowd, pushing Christ but not touching him; while another man, outside the church, saying "no" to all the formularies, but simply trying to do the will of Christ, might win the Lord's blessing as did the woman who touched the Master. Nobody ever succeeded who habitually mistook small things for great, or great things for small. Yet this is exactly what the church has been doing, and is now, to a great extent, doing—reading life with a wrong emphasis. There is something fearfully un-Christian somewhere in a business world in which a common cab-horse is better cared for than a common man; where men want work, and there is no work for them to do, and for want of work they starve; where still other men work and work and work, from the dark of morning to the dark of evening, and have absolutely nothing in their lives but work. It is the duty of every man who is an employer of labor to study this problem as he studies his account-book or his prayer-book, and try to find the Christian solution. While we have discovered the art of gathering wealth, we have not learned how to distribute wealth, on Christian terms, among those who produce it. The employers of labor, the owners of the tenement houses, the lords and princes of the industrial world are, for the most part, members of the Christian churches; and while Jesus Christ loved the poor, that is more than can honestly be said of the great company of Christians. Nevertheless, every year finds the world more Christian; and year by year the church itself is being more and more converted to Christianity. We have no greater problems in the world today than those of doubt and of poverty. These problems are to be met, not by talking a great deal, but by trying to live the Christ life every day in the week. The solution of the problem of Christianity is the Christianization of human life.

A Commentary on the Books of Amos, Hosea, and Micah. By John Merlin Powis Smith, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures, the University of Chicago. New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. x+216. $0.75.

This is the latest addition to the "Bible for Home and School," and is one of the best in the series. Professor Smith was a colaborer with the late President Harper in the preparation of the commentaries on Amos and Hosea in the *International Critical Commentary* and is himself the author of the commentary on Micah in the same series. He has crystallized in this little book the best of the learning on these prophets of which his previous labors had made him master, and has presented it with great clearness. He is thorough and critical, but at the same time sane and conservative. The most novel feature of his treatment is his interpretation of the marriage of Hosea, but with this readers of the *Biblical World* are already familiar (see XLII, 94–101). It is an interpretation which commends itself. The commentary evinces not only learning but sympathetic religious insight.

THE ORIGIN AND TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS. X

By ERNEST DE WITT BURTON and FRED MERRIFIELD

AN OUTLINE BIBLE-STUDY COURSE OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

With this number appears the last instalment of this course. Question sheets containi - twenty questions on the work of each month have been prepared and may be secured by all students who have enrolled as members of the INSTITUTE, *upon application, with two cents for postage. The return of the question sheets filled out will entitle the student to a certificate for the course.*

STUDY IX

CHAPTER XIV

SERMONS IN DEFENSE OF THE SUPREMACY OF JESUS
THE GOSPEL AND THE EPISTLES OF JOHN

First day.—§ 87. *The authorship and purpose of the Johannine writings (I John, II John, III John, and the Gospel according to John).* Here, as in the case of so many other biblical books, scholars are frankly divided with respect especially to the question of authorship. An ancient and all but uniform tradition of the church attributes these four books to John, the Apostle of Jesus. Read the following passages and note the internal evidence which is held to corroborate this view: (*a*) the author's familiarity with Jewish history, customs, and ideas (John 1:17; 11:49, 51; 2:13; 7:2–13; 2:14–16; 5:10 ff.; 11:44; 2:20; 7:23); (*b*) his acquaintance with the Old Testament and his habit of seeing in it direct prophecies concerning Jesus (2:17, 22; 12:15, 38–41; 20:9); (*c*) his familiarity with Hebrew (1:38; 5:2; 9:7), hence his Jewish origin; (*d*) his familiarity with the geography of Palestine, especially around Jerusalem; (*e*) his perfect devotion to Jesus (20:30, 31; 3:16–21); (*f*) his claims as an eyewitness of these events (19:35; 21:24; cf. also 1:14 and I John 1:1–3); (*g*) the testimony of John 21:20, 42.

On the other hand, not a few scholars believe that a Hellenistic Jew of the second century, perhaps a resident of Ephesus but now quite unknown, is the author of at least the Fourth Gospel; possibly, though not certainly, of the three letters also. Some think that Mark 10:38, 39 (cf. Acts 12:1–3) points to the probable early death of John the apostle; they claim that several Johns are probably confused, that Jesus' disciple never certainly took up his abode in Asia Minor, and especially that he could hardly have changed enough from his early conservative position to become the author of such books as these.

Whether from one John or another, or whether put out under the apostle's name, as would have been possible according to the custom in those days, these

four books bear permanent messages to all ages. The first and second letters seek to strengthen the faith of Christian brethren, especially as against the influence of disturbing "heresies" which were creeping into the church (notably Libertinism and Docetism). The third letter is meant to encourage Gaius in his hospitality toward visiting Christian workers and to inform him of the writer's proposed visit. The Fourth Gospel seems to have been written in order, first, to oppose certain conceptions of God and the world which belittled or excluded the work of Christ; second, to denounce the doctrine of the messiahship of John the Baptist; and third, especially to show the importance of belief in Jesus as the revealer of God and the only way of gaining the joys of eternal life (20:31).

Glance over the following outline.

ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST LETTER OF JOHN

1. Introduction. The writer's message and his purpose in writing (1:1–4).
2. Christians to keep themselves from sin, walking in the light, and to seek forgiveness through Christ (1:5—2:17).
3. Not to be led astray by anti-Christs, but to abide in God (2:18–28).
4. The children of God to purify themselves; they that sin are not of God, but of the devil (2:29—3:12).
5. Christians will be hated by the world, but are to love one another in truth (3:13–24).
6. Spirits to be tested by what they say of Jesus (4:1–6).
7. Christians are to love one another and love God, because God loves them (4:7–21).
8. Love comes through faith, and faith rests on the testimony of God, and gives assurance of eternal life (5:1–13).
9. Christians to pray for one another's forgiveness (5:14–17).
10. Conclusion. The Christian's certainties (5:18–21).

Second day.—§ 88. *The first letter of John.* Read I John 1:1–4, noticing what the writer claims in this paragraph concerning his relation to Jesus (cf. John's Gospel 1:1–18, especially vs. 14). Read 1:5—2:17, noticing the strong emphasis which the writer puts upon the separation which exists between the world of light and the world of darkness, and upon the impossibility that the children of God should continue in sin. Note those things here indicated as characteristic of the children of God and the things which are impossible to them. Read 2:18–29, noticing the evidence that there are some who are endeavoring to lead astray those to whom the letter is written, and observing what truth the writer held which these false teachers denied. Read 3:1–12. Try to reconstruct, from these passages, the vital religious convictions which impelled the author to write.

Third day.—Read 3:13–24. In those trying days, what were the marks of Christian loyalty, as our author believed? Notice in 4:1–6 the recurrence of the same ideas expressed in 2:18 ff. What do these words imply as to the nature of the opposition felt and so solemnly denounced? How noble the character also that could utter such persuasive words as those in 4:7–21! Cf. 2:9–11 and 3:10, 14. Consult the analysis and read 5:1–13, also 2:18 ff., and 4:1 ff. again. Likewise read 5:14–21. It requires a man of great wealth of experience to utter such convictions in such intense fashion, does it not?

Fourth day.—§ 89. *The second and third letters of John.* Read the second letter of John. It is doubted and cannot be decided certainly whether "the elect lady" and her children are a Christian woman and her family or a church and its members. Read it first on the first supposition, noticing what the writer says of the children, and against whom he warns the lady and her children. Then read it on the second supposition. Read the third letter of John, noticing whom he commends and for what, and whom he condemns and for what. If the three letters of John were written toward the end of the apostolic age what picture do they afford us of the condition of the church as the New Testament period of the history of the church draws to a close?

Fifth day.—§ 90. *The prologue of the Fourth Gospel:* John 1:1–18. Note in vss. 1–5 a conception not elsewhere found in our Gospels. The term "Word" was familiar to the Greek readers of this gospel, signifying to them that through which, or a being through whom, God expresses and reveals himself to humanity. Our author, eager to defend Jesus as the unique, final, and all-sufficient revelation of God, interprets his own Christian experience thus into Greek thought: A heavenly Being, close to God from the beginning of time, and even sharing the divine nature as well as being the agent of all creation (vss. 1–3), has appeared among men to give them life and light; but humanity has failed to appreciate even so wonderful a revelation from God (vss. 4–5)! When men are on tiptoe asking where and how, and while some are saying it must have been John the Baptist, the answer comes in vss. 6–8 and 15: not John, but Jesus is the bearer of this light (vss. 9–14, 16–18). In what definite respects does the author regard Jesus as superior to both John and Moses? The following analysis, departing somewhat from the order of the Gospel as it stands to accord more nearly with what we believe to have been the original arrangement of these sermons, should be studied and followed with care.

ANALYSIS OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN

I. The Prologue of the Gospel: The central doctrines of the book so expressed in terms of current thought as to relate the former to the latter and facilitate the transition from the latter to the former (1:1–18).

II. The period of beginnings: John bears his testimony; Jesus begins to reveal himself; faith is begotten in some, and the first signs of opposition appear (1:19—4:54).

1. The testimony of John and the beginnings of faith in Jesus (1:19—2:12).
   - *a)* The testimony of John to the representatives of the Jews (1:19–28).
   - *b)* John points out Jesus as the Lamb of God and the one whom he had come to announce (1:29–34).
   - *c)* John points out Jesus to his own disciples, and two of them follow Jesus (1:35–42).
   - *d)* Jesus gains two other followers (1:43–51).
   - *e)* In Cana of Galilee Jesus first manifests his glory in a sign and strengthens the faith of his disciples (2:1–12).
2. Jesus in Jerusalem and Judea: opposition and imperfect faith (2:13—3:36).
   - *a)* The cleansing of the temple: opposition manifested (2:13–22).
   - *b)* Unintelligent faith based on signs in Jerusalem (2:23–25).

c) In particular, Nicodemus is reproved and instructed (3:1–15).
d) The motive and effect of divine revelation in the Son (3:16–21).
e) The further testimony of John the Baptist to his own inferiority and Jesus' superiority (3:22–30).
f) The supreme character of the revelation in the Son (3:31–36).

3. Jesus in Samaria, and the beginnings of work in Galilee (chap. 4).
   a) Jesus' self-revelation to the Samaritan woman, and the simple faith of the Samaritans (4:1–42).
   b) The reception of Jesus in Galilee, for the most part on the basis of signs seen, but in one case without waiting for such evidence (4:43, 45, 46*a*, 44, 46*b*–54).

III. The central period of Jesus' ministry, to the end of his public teaching: Jesus declares himself more and more fully, many believe on him, and the faith of his disciples is strengthened, but the leaders of the nation reject him and resolve upon his death (chaps. 5–12).

1. The feeding of the five thousand and attendant events leading to the discourse on Jesus as the Bread of Life, in consequence of which many leave him, but the Twelve believe in him more firmly (chap. 6).
2. The healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, raising the Sabbath question and then the question of Jesus' relation to his Father, God (chap. 5).
3. Jesus' marvelous wisdom (7:15–24).
4. Secret hostility to Jesus. A few secretly defend him as "a good man" (7:1–13).
5. His temple-sermons divide the people (7:14, 25–36, 45–52, 37–44).
6. The necessity of faith in Jesus as the Son of God and the superior of Abraham (8:21–59).
7. Jesus the Light of the World (9:1–41; 10:19–21; 8:12–20).
8. Jesus the Good Shepherd and the Door of the Fold (10:22–29, 1–18).
9. Jesus' oneness with the Father (10:30–42).
10. The raising of Lazarus, and the teaching of Jesus concerning himself as the Resurrection and the Life (chap. 11).
11. Jesus' last presentation of himself to the Jews of Jerusalem (chap. 12).
    a) Jesus anointed by Mary at Bethany (12:1–11).
    b) The triumphal entry (12:12–19).
    c) The coming of the Gentiles to see Jesus: Jesus' announcement of his death and its results (12:20–36*a*).
    d) Eternal life through Jesus (12:44–50).
    e) Only the elect believe on him (12:36*b*–43).

IV. The fuller revelation of Jesus to his believing disciples (chaps. 13–17).

1. The washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus, and the lesson of humility and service (13:1–20).
2. The prediction of the betrayal, and the withdrawal of the betrayer (13:21–30).
3. The farewell discourses of Jesus (13:31*a*; 15:1—16:33; 13:31*b*–35).
4. Peter forewarned of his coming cowardice (13:36–38).
5. Last instructions and encouragements (14:1–31).
6. The final prayer: a revelation of Jesus' foreknowledge (17:1–26).

V. The culmination and apparent triumph of hostile unbelief (chaps. 18, 19).
   1. The arrest of Jesus (18:1–14).
   2. The trial before the Jewish authorities, and Peter's denial (18:19–24, 15–18, 25*b*–27).
   3. The trial before Pilate (18:28—19:16).
   4. The crucifixion (19:17–30).
   5. The burial (19:31–42).

VI. The triumph of Jesus over death and his enemies: the restoration and confirmation of faith (chap. 20).
   1. The empty tomb (20:1–10).
   2. The appearance of Jesus to Mary (20:11–18).
   3. The appearance to the disciples, Thomas being absent (20:19–25).
   4. The appearance to Thomas with the other disciples (20:26–29).
   5. Conclusion of the Gospel, stating the purpose for which it was written (20:30, 31).

VII. Appendix (chap. 21).
   1. Appearance of Jesus to the Seven by the Sea of Galilee, and his words concerning the tarrying of the beloved disciple (21:1–24).
   2. Second conclusion of the Gospel (21:25).

Sixth day.—§ 91. *The period of beginnings:* John 1:19—4:54. After reading 1:19—2:12, consider the following questions: What was John the Baptist's mission as this author looks at it from his second-century viewpoint (1:19–36)? Why have not the other Gospels taken notice of such important testimony? What is the significance of the titles applied to Jesus? According to this gospel, how does Jesus gain his first followers (1:37–51; cf. Mark 1:16–20)? What are the leading characteristics of Jesus, as here sketched? Keep a list of these as you read the Gospel. In 2:1–12 we are given a new miracle: the creation of 100 or more gallons of excellent wine out of water. What does Jesus accomplish by this demonstration? Note the importance of Cana and the comparative insignificance of Capernaum and Nazareth in this gospel.

Seventh day.—Read 2:13—3:36. Why does the author so strongly emphasize Jesus' work at Jerusalem, and touch so lightly upon the work at Capernaum, and why does he transfer the temple-cleansing to the beginning of his career (2:13–22)? How does this story differ from Mark's account (Mark 11:11, 15–18)? Does this represent Jesus as successful at first (2:23—3:21)? What further characteristics of Jesus does the author give in these verses? What warnings does he most earnestly present to his non-Christian readers? Again a careful contrast is drawn between John and Jesus (3:22–36). How would John's devoted followers in Ephesus receive these arguments? Put yourself in their place; then in the author's.

Eighth day.—Noting the slight changes in order suggested in the analysis, read chap. 4: (1) another John-Jesus contrast (vss. 1–3); (2) an illustrated sermon on "Jesus the Water of Life" (vss. 4–42). The other gospels keep his messiahship secret until the close of his Galilean work. Which is correct? (3) Another startling display of power at Cana (4:43–54; cf. Matt. 8:5–10). Does he gain most followers by miracles or by his teaching? How much progress has he made so far?

Ninth day.—§ 92. *The central period of Jesus' ministry:* chaps. 5–12. Note in 6:1–15 that, to the second-century Christians, Jesus' career was filled with "signs" of his divinity. His every word and act are studied for further evidence of this great fact. What kind of a "kingship" does Jesus avoid, and why? In what striking particulars does John 6:16–21 differ from Mark's account of this incident (Mark 6:45–52)? Read John 6:22–71 as a sermon on "Jesus the Bread of Life." Which is the author's own interpretation of Jesus' thought, the literal (vss. 51, 55, 56) or the spiritual (vs. 63)?

Tenth day.—Chap. 5 should be read next. It presents "Jesus the Resurrection-life." When may eternal life begin (vs. 24)? Just how does Jesus impart life to others (vs. 26)? How dependent is he himself upon God for his life and power (vss. 19, 20, 30)? Once again, what is the relation of John the Baptist (vss. 32–36) and of Moses (vss. 45, 46, 47) to Jesus, as our author sees it? Is it still possible that we may "know our Bibles," and yet not experience the life and love of God (vss. 37–42)?

Eleventh day.—Read 7:15–24. To the author it is perfectly clear where Jesus gets his wisdom and power. In 7:1–13 which follows, how do various groups of people regard Jesus? (Cf. John 7:1 and Mark 10:1.) Does he flee from the north or to the north? What problems does Jesus raise among his opponents and his friends (7:14, 25–36, 45–52, 37–44, in this order)? The lines are being drawn more and more tightly. Note the warning which follows in tomorrow's reading.

Twelfth day.—Read 8:21–59. What, in the author's opinion, are the grave dangers of unbelief, and the blessings of a firm faith in Jesus? The "Word," who had full sway over Jesus' life, was evidently thought of as having always existed (cf. 1:1): hence antedating Abraham, and even inspiring prophetic faith in that ancient Father of the nation; for the Word was the source of all life, even Abraham's (1:4). The passage 7:53—8:11 does not belong to this gospel. It is commonly found, in the last manuscripts, after Mark 12:44 or Luke 21. It seems authentic, and certainly represents the spirit of Jesus.

Thirteenth day.—"Jesus the Light of the World" is the theme of 9:1–41. How was the Light received in different quarters?

Fourteenth day.—10:19–21, followed by 8:12–20, continues yesterday's theme. Jesus' unusual power is recognized to some extent, but how is it accounted for (10:20, 21)? In what sense can Jesus enlighten the world (8:12)? How do you reconcile 9:39, already studied, and 8:15*b?* Is vs. 16 a compromise view? In what sense is Jesus a judge of men?

Fifteenth day.—Read 10:22–29 and then 10:1–18, two new presentations of Jesus: (1) as the "Good Shepherd"; (2) as the "Door of the Sheepfold." What are the characteristics of Jesus as here given; of the "sheep"; of others who turn away from him?

Sixteenth day.—10:30–42 follows: "Jesus the Son of God." How does our author here explain Jesus' relation to the Father? Is vs. 30 explained by 1:1 f.? (Cf. 17:21, 22; also Matt. 11:27.) How far does the thought of the Synoptic Gospels on this point differ from that of the Fourth Gospel? Read Ps. 82:6 with John 10:35, 36. What is the author's argument? Is he, a Jewish-Christian, eager to retain his monotheism and yet accord Jesus this exalted position? We have still another John-Jesus contrast in vss. 40–42. How many does this make in

all? Were John's followers in Ephesus likely to become Jesus' followers through these arguments? Why did the John-group persist for several centuries afterward, clinging to their Master John as the Christ?

Seventeenth day.—Another sermon on "Jesus the Resurrection and the Life." Read chap. 11 (cf. Luke 10:38–42). In what sense is Jesus "our life"?

Eighteenth day.—In reading 12:1–36*a*, note Jesus' appreciation of the devotion of his friends (vss. 1–8); note also the author's continued emphasis upon miracle as the basis of belief (vss. 9–11). Cf. this account of the entry into Jerusalem with Mark's (cf. John 12:12–19 with Mark 11:1–11). Looking back eighty years, our author now sees the gentile world coming to Jesus (vss. 20–22); but he remembers that this marvel has come about only through the sacrifice of Jesus (vss. 23–33), and, in spite of all the appeals of Jesus to his Jewish people (vss. 34–36*a*, 44–50), through the hardening of Jewish hearts to his message (vss. 36*b*–43).

Nineteenth day.—§ 93. *The fuller revelation of Jesus to his believing disciples:* chaps. 13–17. Read 13:1–20. How far could Jesus see into the future (vs. 1*a*)? Would foreknowledge of events help or hinder one's career? What is Jesus' greatest characteristic—the spirit which explains his power over men (vs. 1*b*)? Reviewing his career, in what definite ways did he "serve" his followers (vss. 15–17)? Did Jesus do all he could to prevent Judas' treachery? Was Judas at fault, or predestined to do this and therefore blameless (vss. 18, 19)? Now read vss. 21–30.

Twentieth day.—Read 13:31*a*, followed by 15:1–27 which seems to fit better in this place. Just how much had Jesus done to bring these men into close fellowship with God (15:1–3)? What precautions and encouragements are here suggested for the safeguarding of the religious life (vss. 4–20)? Have men in general been fair to the claims of Jesus (vss. 21–25)? Have Jesus' followers done their full duty as witnesses of his power and helpfulness (vss. 26, 27)?

Twenty-first day.—Read chap. 16 and 13:31*b*–35 which now fits in here. In reading 16:1–4*a*, cf. Mark 13:9–13. In reading vs. 5, note that, according to our better order, 13:36 has not yet come. It seems to be a later question. Years after Jesus' death, could the church agree with the thought expressed in 16:7? What do vss. 8–15 suggest as to the actual history of the church between Jesus' death and the writing of this gospel? By the second century many Christians were seriously doubting whether Jesus would ever return from Heaven. Does our author seek to solve this difficulty by his oft-repeated "a little while" and his assurance that Jesus really came as the Comforter (vs. 7*b*) at Pentecost? What great convictions of Jesus are adapted to sustain his followers in their hours of sore trial (16:32*b*, 33*c*; 13:34*b*, 35)?

Twenty-second day.—John 13:36–38 shows Peter's splendid devotion to Jesus. May this passage have meant to the author that Peter did actually suffer martyrdom? The weakness of an hour shamed him into lifelong courage. Make a careful list of the encouragements to the Christian life which second-century Christians must have drawn from the words of chap. 14.

Twenty-third day.—Read, with especial care, chap. 17. Is it possible that the author has not so much reported an actual prayer of Jesus as ventured to ascribe to Jesus the kind of prayer which it seemed to him Jesus with his intimacy of fellowship and consequent foresight of the future would offer at such a time? Would Jesus, with his accustomed humility, and with his love for all men, have

been likely to say some of these words, which in another's thought of him might be justified? The author evidently feels, and expresses, great convictions drawn from his own vital Christian experience.

Twenty-fourth day.—§ 94. *The culmination and apparent triumph of hostile unbelief:* chaps. 18 and 19. Cf. 18:1–14 carefully with Mark's account of Jesus' arrest (Mark 14:43–52). How do you account for the striking differences? Note the new details in 18:19–24. Is it not strange the other gospel-writers did not include these events?

Twenty-fifth day.—Note the further new details in 18:15–18. Has the author of our gospel a special interest in this mysterious "other disciple"? Does he evidently refer to the apostle John? Is vs. 25*a* an editor's repetition (cf. vs. 18*c*) after inserting vss. 19–24? Read now vss. 25*b*–27, comparing Mark 14:66–72. More new details arise in John 18:28–32, and especially in vss. 33–40 (cf. Mark 15:1–5). Did this author have any authentic sources which the men of the previous eighty years were denied?

Twenty-sixth day.—Read 19:1–16 with Mark's briefer story (15:16–20). What new elements also in John 19:17–25? Is vs. 17 meant to correct Mark 15:21 and to deny the gnostic story that it was really Simon of Cyrene, not Jesus, who died upon the cross? Have you discovered many such deliberate changes from the earlier gospel narratives? Keep a list of such passages and mark them if possible, in a harmony of the Gospels, e.g., Stevens and Burton's *Harmony of the Gospels.*

Twenty-seventh day.—Does Mark (14:50 and 16:8) imply that the disciples fled to Galilee immediately after the crucifixion? Read John 19:25*b*–30. Did John alone of the Twelve have the courage to face the danger of being seen at the place of crucifixion? Note also the three new sayings from the cross (John 19:26, 28, 30; cf. the one saying in Mark 15:34, followed by Matthew, and three quite different ones in Luke 23:34, 43, 46). Which gospel is most likely to represent Jesus' dying thoughts correctly?

Twenty-eighth day.—Read 19:31–42, noting all the changes from the synoptic accounts of Jesus' burial. Can you explain these changes?

Twenty-ninth day.—§ 95. *The triumph of Jesus over death and his enemies:* chap. 20. Once again make a close comparison between these statements and the narratives given in the first three gospels; note the differences and explain the author's purpose in them. How does his book end (20:30, 31)?

Thirtieth day.—§ 96. *Appendix to the Fourth Gospel.* Chap. 21 is clearly an addition to the gospel already completed in 20:30, 31. Three purposes seem to be apparent in it: First, the writer wishes to give to Peter his place of importance which he doubtless held in the thought of the church (cf. Matt. 16:18), but which the body of this gospel had not given him. Secondly, he wished to reinforce the early tradition of Jesus' appearance in Galilee (Mark 16:7; Matt. 28:16), which had fallen away from Luke and the Fourth Gospel, though he does not even now make the first appearance to Peter, as Paul does (I Cor. 15:5). Thirdly, he wished to ascribe the authorship of the discourses distinctly to the disciple whom Jesus loved, doubtless meaning John. Perhaps also he wished to offset a certain discrediting of John arising from his death after it had been reported that Jesus had promised he should not die by affirming that Jesus did not precisely predict that John would not die, but only suggested the possibility that he would not.

GENERAL INDEX

PAGE

American Institute of Sacred Literature, The.....44, 65, 123, 144, 194, 209, 265, 281, 333, 354, 403, 419
Anniversary, A New Testament; 1514–1914..... 164
ANTHONY, A. W., Principles of Church Federation.....87, 167, 321
Attempt at a Scientific Classification of Biblical Literature, An..... 251

BARTON, GEORGE A., An Attempt at a Scientific Classification of Biblical Literature..... 251
Bible as Material for Sex Instruction, The 91
Biblical Literature, An Attempt at a Scientific Classification of..... 251
Book of the Month, The.....59, 205, 416
BROWN, FRANCIS, Samuel Rolles Driver.. 291
BROWN, WILLIAM ADAMS, Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel 17, 105, 226, 382
BURLING, JAMES PERKINS, The Bible as Material for Sex Instruction..... 91
BURTON, ERNEST D., Origin and Teaching of the New Testament Books 65, 144, 209, 281, 354, 419
The Student Volunteer Convention of 1914..... 118

Can Religion Be Made Scientific?..... 178
CASE, SHIRLEY JACKSON, Christianity and the Mystery Religions..... 3
Christianity and the Mystery Religions.. 3
Church and the Present-Day Labor Struggle, The..... 155
Church and the World, The 53, 134, 202, 273, 346, 414
Church Federation, Principles of...87, 167, 321
Conversation, An Imaginary..... 305
Correction, A..... 304
COULTER, JOHN M., Regeneration in Plants..... 377
Current Opinion.....50, 131, 200, 270, 340, 410
CUTTEN, GEORGE BARTON, Shall the Churches Take Psychical Research Seriously?..... 94

PAGE

DELK, EDWIN HEYL, Divorce and Social Welfare..... 33
Divinity of Christ, The..... 295
Divorce and Social Welfare..... 33
Driver, Samuel Rolles..... 291

Editorials:
The Will to Get and the Will to Give... 1
Sheep in Wolves' Clothing..... 73
The Social Optimism of Faith in a Divine Jesus..... 153
"Of All Men the Most Miserable".... 217
Entertaining People into the Kingdom of God..... 289
Leaking at the Top..... 361
Educational Work of the Church, The 123, 194, 265, 333, 403

FOSTER, ALLYN K., Can Religion Be Made Scientific?..... 178
FULLERTON, KEMPER, Review of Batten, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah... 205

GOODSPEED, E. J., A New Testament Anniversary..... 164

HUGHES, RICHARD C., Survey of the Relation of the Church to State Universities..... 363

Jesus, The Teaching of..... 238
John the Baptist and Christ in the Slavic Translation of Josephus' *Jewish War*... 172
JOHNSON, FRANKLIN W., The Problems of Boyhood—A Course of Ethics for Boys in the Sunday School 29, 99, 187, 257, 326, 396
JORDAN, W. G., Review of Smith, The Religion of Israel: An Historical Study 416

Labor Struggle, The Church and the Present-Day..... 155
Life of Jesus in the Light of Modern Criticism, The..... 75

MERRIFIELD, FRED, Origin and Teaching of the New Testament Books 65, 144, 209, 281, 354, 419

PAGE

MILLER, LUCIUS HOPKINS, The Life of Jesus in the Light of Modern Criticism 75
The Teaching of Jesus..... 238
The Divinity of Christ..... 295
Modern Criticism, The Life of Jesus in the Light of..... 75
Modern Sadducee, The.....120
Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel.....17, 105, 226, 382
MONTGOMERY, JAMES A., Present Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism..... 310

New Testament Anniversary; 1514–1914, A..... 164

Origin and Teaching of the New Testament Books, The..65, 144, 209, 281, 354, 419

PARKER, A. K., An Imaginary Conversation..... 305
PICK, BERNHARD, John the Baptist and Christ in the Slavic Translation of Josephus' *Jewish War*..... 172
Plants, Regeneration in..... 377
Present Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism..... 310
Principles of Church Federation...87, 167, 321
Problems of Boyhood, The 29, 99, 187, 257, 326, 396
Psychical Research, Shall the Churches Take Seriously?..... 94

Regeneration in Plants..... 377
Religion, Can It Be Made Scientific?.... 178
Religion of the Hebrews and Modern Scholarship, The..... 44
ROSS, G. A. JOHNSTON, "Bitterness"—A Sermon..... 219

Sadducee, The Modern..... 120
Samuel Rolles Driver..... 289
Sermon, "Bitterness"—A..... 219
Sex Instruction, The Bible as Material for 91
Shall the Churches Take Psychical Research Seriously?..... 94
SMITH, J. M. POWIS, Religion of the Hebrews and Modern Scholarship, The 44
Review of Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English..... 59
SOARES, THEODORE GERALD, The Educational Work of the Church 123, 194, 265, 333, 403
State Universities, Survey of the Relation of the Churches to 363
Student Volunteer Convention of 1914, The..... 118
Suggestions to Leaders of Classes 48, 128, 199, 268, 338, 408
Survey of the Relation of the Churches to State Universities..... 363

Teaching of Jesus, The..... 238
"Thus Saith Jehovah"..... 86

WILLIAMS, J. E., The Church and the Present-Day Labor Struggle..... 155

Book Reviews

Adams, The Theory of Social Revolutions. 140
Ayer, A Source Book for Ancient History. 278
Batten, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah..... 205
Beard, An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States..... 279
Braithwaite, The Beginnings of Quakerism..... 61
Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel from the Eighth to the Fifth Century..... 351
Cannon, The Song of Songs, Edited as a Dramatic Poem..... 139
Charles, R. H., et al, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English..... 59
Clow, Christ in the Social Order..... 141
Cooke, (1) The Book of Judges in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes and (2) The Book of Ruth in the Revised Version with Introduction and Notes..... 279
Dickinson, The Christian Reconstruction of Modern Life..... 63
Eddy, The New Era in Asia..... 352
Goodrich, Our Neighbors, the Chinese... 280
Gordon, Anna A., The Life of Frances E. Willard..... 63
Gordon, G. A., Revelation and the Ideal.. 350
Handcock, P., The Latest Light on Bible Lands..... 141
Hardy, The Religious Instinct..... 62

PAGE

Hetzenauer, Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti V pont. max. jussu recognita et Clementis VIII auctoritate edita... 351
Hill, What Shall We Do without Jesus?.. 140
Hodges, Christianity between Sundays... 418
Holder, The Quakers in England and America... 278
James, Old Testament Legends; Being Stories Out of Some of the Less-Known Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament... 140
Jastrow, Hebrew and Babylonian Traditions... 417
Jones, et al, The Quakers in the American Colonies... 208
Lichtenberger, Germany and Its Evolution in Modern Times... 207
Martin, The Life of Jesus... 350
Mercer (Editor), Extra-biblical Sources for Hebrew and Jewish History... 139
Miller, The Glory of the Commonplace... 64
Milligan, The New Testament Documents: Their Origin and Early History 142
Mott, Continuation Committee Conferences in Asia, 1912–1913... 350
Moulton, Religion and Religions... 208
Plassmann, The Signification of bᵉrākā.. 64
Selbie, Schleiermacher: A Critical and Historical Study... 62
Shotwell, The Religious Revolution of Today... 142
Simkhovitch, Marxism versus Socialism.. 280
Smith, H. P., The Religion of Israel: An Historical Study... 416
Smith, J. M. P., A Commentary on the Books of Amos, Hosea, and Micah.... 418
Soothill, The Three Religions of China... 143
Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament... 142
Stead, My Father: Reminiscences of W. T. Stead... 278
Thompson, English Monasteries... 143
Trumbull, Anthony Comstock, Fighter... 63
Vedder, The Reformation in Germany.... 279
Vogels, Codex Rehdigeranus... 63
Walling, The Larger Aspects of Socialism. 352
Ward, Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman... 352
Weaver, The Religious Development of the Child... 62

Book Notices

Aked, The Divine Drama of Job... 143
Alford, Jewish History and Literature under the Maccabees and Herod... 64
Boggis, Praying for the Dead... 353
Burrell, In the Upper Room... 143
Figgis, Antichrist and Other Sermons.... 143
Hawes, New Thrills in Old China... 64
Hodges, Classbook of Old Testament History... 64
Kunze, The Apostles' Creed and the New Testament... 280
Lee, The New Testament Period and Its Leaders... 64
Mayor, Twelve Parochial Sermons... 353
Pick, Jesus in the Talmud... 353
Ross, The God We Trust... 280
Stokes, The Gospel according to the Jews and Pagans... 208
Temple, Repton School Sermons... 143
Use of the Bible among School Boys... 353
Vaughn, A Mirror of the Soul... 143
Welch, The Story of Joseph... 143

BS
410
B58
n.s.
v.43

The Biblical world

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY